MARY STUART

MARY STUART

HER GUILT OR INNOCENCE

AN INQUIRY INTO
THE SECRET HISTORY OF HER TIMES

By ALEXANDER M'NEEL-CAIRD

SECOND EDITION

WITH REPLY TO MR. FROUDE

EDINBURGH
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1866

DA787
.A1C2

Printed by R. CLARK, *Edinburgh.*

PREFACE.

THESE pages were composed in the shape of lectures to a provincial audience, at whose desire they are now published. Though revised, they retain many defects, incident to their origin, which require this explanation and apology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION, WITH REPLY TO MR FROUDE xxiii

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF MARY STUART'S LIFE AND MISFORTUNES—Statement of the Historical Problem which they involve . . 1

CHAPTER II.

Struggle between France and England for Influence in Scotland—Intrigues for Mary's Hand—The Regent HAMILTON's Tergiversations—The Contest between the Houses of Hamilton and LENNOX—Lennox forfeited for Treason, and Banished—Mary's Education in France—Her Marriage at sixteen to the DAUPHIN—Naturalisation of Scotchmen in France—Deeds affecting the Crown fraudulently obtained from the young Queen before her Marriage—The Perils arising from these, and how they were escaped—JOHN KNOX—His Dislike of Female Sovereigns—His "Blast against the Regiment of Women" 5

CHAPTER III.

Mary Stuart becomes QUEEN OF FRANCE—Continued Struggle of Foreign Influence in Scotland—War of Creeds—Alarming Insurrection of 1559—Encouraged by QUEEN ELIZABETH—Her Jealousy of Mary's Claims on the Crown of England—Elizabeth's Title to that Crown Parliamentary, Mary's founded on Legitimacy—LORD JAMES STUART, Prior of St. Andrews (Mary's

Page

Illegitimate Brother), leads the Insurrection against her in Scotland—His Schemes for usurping the Government countenanced by Elizabeth—Secret Interview between Knox and Croft—Hamilton again changes sides, and joins the Insurgents—His Motives—How this disconcerted the Scheme in favour of Lord James—Elizabeth secretly sends aid—Her Convoy of Treasure intercepted by BOTHWELL—Elizabeth dissembles—HUNTLY induced by the Lord James to join the Insurgents—The Lord James's Treachery—Elizabeth at last openly sends an Army and establishes a Blockade of the Firth of Forth—SIEGE OF LEITH—It is taken—TREATY OF LEITH—Its Ambiguity—It was never Ratified—Scottish Parliament met—Abolished Pope's Jurisdiction and established the *Confession of Faith*—These Acts not formally assented to by the Crown, but acquiesced in by Mary and enforced by Law—Prohibition by Parliament of the Roman Catholic Religion under Pain of Confiscation, Banishment, and Death—Mary declares for Freedom of Opinion—Death of her Husband the King of France, by which she loses that Crown, and the jealousies of the Scotch of French influence come to an end 9

CHAPTER IV.

The Lord James goes to France to confer with his Sister, the young Queen—Persuades her that Huntly was a chief Conspirator against her, and obtains for himself her full Commission and Authority—Mary's Application to Elizabeth for Safe-conduct that she might return to Scotland—Secret Conference of the Lord James, MORTON, and LETHINGTON, with the English Ambassador—Elizabeth refuses the Safe-conduct—Mary sails without it, and arrives safe in Scotland—Elizabeth congratulates her—Disturbances at Holyrood when Queen attempted to have Mass in her Private Chapel—Her Proclamation giving Assurance that Protestant Order of Religion should not be Disturbed—The Lord James and Mary's chief Counsellors in the Secret Pay of Elizabeth—He proceeds to carry out his Designs against Huntly, forces him into Rebellion, ruins him, confiscates his Estates, and from the spoils obtains the EARLDOM OF MURRAY 15

CHAPTER V.

Page

Holders of Catholic Benefices contribute a Third of their Revenues to the Crown and the Protestant Ministers—Pithy Opinions expressed of the Arrangement by Knox and Lethington—Murray's singular "ACT OF OBLIVION," designed to perpetuate his Power—Knox quarrels with Murray and exposes his Motives—Murray's Character according to Froude, Knox, and Melville—Pungent Lines on Lethington's Crooked Policy—Mary pleads with Knox for Toleration to the Catholics—He refuses—The Romish Prelates and others Punished by Imprisonment for celebrating the Mass—Murray seeks to have himself Legitimated 20

CHAPTER VI.

Contemporary Opinions of Mary Stuart's Character—THROKMORTON'S Account of her—RANDOLPH'S—SCROPE'S—KNOLLYS'—Lethington's—Murray's Council—Sir JAMES MELVILLE'S—The EARL OF SHREWSBURY'S—Her Writings—Her confidential Correspondence—Her Library included the Writings of the great Reformers 25

CHAPTER VII.

Mary's numerous Suitors—Elizabeth's alarm—Her apprehensions of the Catholic Party in England, and her fear that Mary might strengthen herself by marrying a Continental Prince—Mary's willingness to be advised by her if secured in the English Succession—Elizabeth's enigmatic conduct on the subject—She proposes her own favourite, the EARL OF LEICESTER, as a Suitor for Mary—The suspicious Death of Leicester's Wife—Elizabeth's puzzling conduct—Cecil writes of "these tickle matters"—Mary regards the proposal as ridiculous, but receives it with ostensible respect—Lennox permitted to return from Banishment—He is followed by his son, LORD DARNLEY, who becomes one of Mary's Suitors, and is favourably received

Page

—He attaches David Riccio to his Views—Riccio's previous Position—Suspected to be an Emissary of the Pope—Riccio promotes a Match between Mary and Darnley on Political Grounds—Elizabeth Protests—Murray lays down rules for the Queen's guidance as to her Marriage—Elizabeth requires the Return of Darnley and Lennox to England under Pain of Confiscation—They disobey—Elizabeth sends Lady Lennox to the Tower—Murray's Reasons for opposing the Marriage—His Grants of Crown Lands revocable—Darnley's incautious remarks on this subject—Morton, Lethington, and others had similar Grants of Crown Lands—They raise the cry of the Kirk in Danger 28

CHAPTER VIII.

Darnley's strange conduct—Demands the Crown-Matrimonial, and attempts to extort it by refusing to complete the Marriage in public—Inexplicable at the time—Unpublished Letter by Randolph to Elizabeth disclosing that Mary and Darnley had been privately Married—He is proclaimed King, and the Marriage is celebrated publicly—He goes to hear Knox preach—Knox preaches against the Rule of Women and Boys—The King summons him before the Council, and orders the Provost of Edinburgh to be deposed—A Fix between Knox and the King—Mary solves the Difficulty—The King and a Poacher—He prohibits the use of Fowling-pieces—Elizabeth stirs up a new Insurrection in Scotland—Murray leads it—His Plot to seize Darnley and imprison Mary—Her Escape—Plot against Darnley's life—Letters on this subject by Randolph to Cecil and Leicester—Morton and Lethington secretly in the Conspiracy with Murray—Mary recalls Bothwell from Banishment, and drives the Rebels into England—Randolph detected in conveying aid to them—Elizabeth obtains from Murray a collusive acknowledgment on his knees that she had not encouraged him—Orders him to be gone for a Traitor, and writes Mary disclaiming all connection with him 35

CHAPTER IX.

Page

Randolph's Position in consequence of Elizabeth's Disavowal—He is thwarted and out-manœuvred by Riccio, and seeks to renew the Conspiracy—Mary and her Husband—Riccio's Influence with Catholic Party strengthened by the success of his policy—King of France sends Darnley the Order of St. Michael—The Heralds of opinion that he could not display the Royal Arms on his Investiture—He renews his demand for Matrimonial Crown—Mary's Letter to the Pope—Compact for putting down Heresy—Her ineffectual Attempts to persuade Bothwell and others to join her at Mass—Riccio advises a Pardon to the House of Hamilton for accession to Murray's Rebellion—Lennox offended by it, owing to the hereditary enmity of their Houses—Darnley's Misconduct—Murray at Newcastle and in Distress—Rebels dissatisfied with the Hamiltons being detached from them—Randolph and Lennox bring Darnley into the Combination—ARCHIBALD DOUGLAS Active—Morton and Lethington secretly in accord with them—Riccio seizes a man who carried gold from Randolph to Murray—Randolph writes to the Earl of Leicester for Elizabeth's private eye that Riccio is to have his throat cut—Riccio warned, but laughs at the danger—Exchange of written Agreements for Riccio's Death—Murray's Pardon and Restoration, and securing to Darnley the Matrimonial Crown and Succession to the Throne if Mary should die childless—Randolph's communication of the Plot, and agreements to Secretary Cecil and to Queen Elizabeth—The subsequent Murder of Riccio—The Queen is Threatened and Imprisoned—Darnley's position as Heir after Mary of both Crowns—Murray, as arranged, reaches Edinburgh after the Murder, and weeps with the Queen in her distress—Discussion whether she should be Executed or Imprisoned for Life—The Law denouncing Death for the Mass would have been the excuse—Darnley Dissolves Parliament—Mary in a private conference succeeds in opening his eyes—He joins her in countermining the Conspirators—They Escape secretly from the Palace, and take refuge in the Castle of Dunbar—Bothwell and Huntly collect forces—

Page

The Queen advances on Edinburgh, and the Conspirators flee —Murray recommends the Perpetrators to Elizabeth's favour —Important Passage on this subject omitted by Dr. Robertson in an original letter which he quotes in his *History*—Elizabeth's conduct—Friar Black murdered on the same night with Riccio—King now denies his share in the Conspiracy, and puts out a Proclamation repudiating the Conspirators—Murray, finding that Darnley had concealed his Bond, applies to Mary for Pardon, which she grants, under the exception of acts directed against her own Person—The Conspiracy goes on, though the Actors have exchanged places—Darnley's Betrayal had ruined their cause for the time, but procures him their undying hatred—Morton and Eighty of them now in Banishment—The grand Catastrophe foreshadowed 43

CHAPTER X.

State of the Country, and of Parties on Riccio's death—Was Knox privy to the Scheme ?—Week of Fasting before Riccio's assassination—Lethington's Policy—Cecil's—Murray's Views—Their position in regard to Darnley—Darnley's in regard to the Crown 65

CHAPTER XI.

Murray joins in a Resolution to punish sharply all who counselled Riccio's death—How this Resolution was defeated—Bothwell's services and position—His previous History—His scheme before Darnley's Marriage to carry off the Queen—His offensive language as to both Queens—His Banishment, and Mary's displeasure with him—Murray's Insurrection renders his Recall necessary—Bothwell is married a few days before Riccio's death to the Queen's cousin—Position of Darnley and his Father—Mary's forbearance—His secret Bond for Riccio's murder exhibited to her—She ignores it—He chafes under Murray's presence, but is afraid to produce his Bond—Murray keeps his ground—Mary gives birth to a Son, James I.—Elizabeth's reception of the news 71

CHAPTER XII.

Page

Darnley's threats against Murray—The Queen makes peace between them—The Birth of James suggests another mode of carrying out the Conspiracy against Mary—Rapid sequence of events—Elizabeth consents to be the Child's Godmother—Lethington's Restoration—Darnley renews his demand for Crown-Matrimonial—State of Parties made such a measure impossible—Proclamation of Border Courts—Darnley refuses to accompany the Queen—His obstinacy—Speaks of leaving the Country—Conference of King and Queen before Privy Council and French Ambassador—He acknowledges he has no ground of complaint—Reports of the Privy Council and French Ambassador—(See also Appendix No. XVI., Parts 1 and 2) . 77

CHAPTER XIII.

Darnley's scheme to enforce his demand for Matrimonial Crown—He still refuses to join the Queen in the Border Courts—She goes to Jedburgh and holds them without his support—Great assemblage there to meet the Queen—Preparations threatened with ridicule—Criminals had all escaped—Bothwell dangerously wounded in attempting, as Lord-Lieutenant, to seize them—Mary goes to Hermitage to consult him—Misrepresentation of this visit in Buchanan's *Detection* — Buchanan's pension from the English Court—(See Appendix No. XVIII.) 84

CHAPTER XIV.

Mary's dangerous illness at Jedburgh—"The root of it is the King"—His tardy visit—She affects to be indifferent—He leaves immediately—She makes her Will—The terms in which she refers to her Husband in it (see Appendix No. XXI.)—Proposal by Murray and others that she should Divorce him—She refuses (see Appendix No. XIX.)—The Prince's Baptism—Affront designed by Elizabeth to Darnley—He consequently absents himself from the Ceremony—Misrepresentations of Mary's Libellers—Bothwell's refusal to enter the Chapel—

Page

Mary urged by Elizabeth, the King of France, and her whole Council, to grant an Amnesty to Morton and his Associates—She complies, excepting Carr of Faudonside—Darnley offended by their Pardon, and again leaves the Court—His deportment incurably bad—He is seized with small-pox 88

CHAPTER XV.

Mary's hopes from Elizabeth's countenance at James's Baptism—Elizabeth's object—Renewal of her old Policy—English Parliament urgent for Settlement of Succession—Elizabeth irritated—Mary's health broken—Her credit in England—English Peers unanimously for her—French Ambassador's Report of her distresses and conduct—Agitating rumours—Murray proposes to proceed against Darnley for Treason—Queen refuses—Still ill of small-pox—She goes to him in Glasgow—He is penitent, and they are reconciled—Grievous mistake of Froude and the younger Tytler—Queen's meeting with Crawford—Darnley accompanies her to Edinburgh—She attends him in his illness—The fears of his Enemies roused by his Restoration—The Position of the Holders of Crown Lands 93

CHAPTER XVI.

Warning given to Darnley by the Lord Robert Stuart—Queen orders immediate inquiry—Lord Robert denies what he had said—Quarrel between him and Darnley—Mary's beautiful Letter to her Husband on this occasion—Afterwards used as a chief instrument of her ruin—Clernault's Report of their good understanding—Warning sent to her by the Ambassador of Spain through her Ambassador at Paris—Arrives a few hours too late 104

CHAPTER XVII.

Explosion at the Kirk of Field, and the King's Murder—Clernault's Report (inedited)—Queen's offer of reward—Placards

Page

and cries at night—Morton and Archibald Douglas chief Murderers—Morton's Conviction fourteen years afterwards—Queen Elizabeth's frantic efforts to prevent his Trial—Leicester's Letter (inedited) hinting at Assassination of Darnley's son, King James, to save Morton—Morton's Execution—His partial Confession—Acknowledgments implied in Correspondence between Morton and Lethington when they quarrelled—Partial Confession of Archibald Douglas 109

CHAPTER XVIII.

Murray's acknowledgment of a Bond between him and Bothwell, Huntly, and Argyle—Confessions of the Laird of Ormiston, and of Bothwell's and Archibald Douglas's Servants—King Strangled before the Explosion—Three parties at the Murder—Bothwell's party blew up the House—Sir James Balfour engaged at the Murder—His strange Letter to Cecil claiming his and Queen Elizabeth's protection from the peril of being tried for the Murder 121

CHAPTER XIX.

Special service of Balfour and Archibald Douglas on occasion of King's Murder—What became of Darnley's Papers?—They would probably have compromised Murray and Randolph—Letter to Cecil stating details of King's death—The watching party of the Conspirators (Andrew Carr's) 126

CHAPTER XX.

The Queen's conduct after the Murder—Warning from Paris of a further Plot still to be executed against her—She takes precautions for the safety of her Child—Why were not more energetic efforts used to bring the Murderers to justice?—Bothwell's collusive Trial—Murray, Morton, and others convene Parliament, and hurry through Confirmations of their own Grants of Crown Lands, within seventy days after Darnley's

Page

death—Murray goes abroad—His Will—His Nomination of Mary Queen of Scots to direct his Daughter's Education and direct his Executors for her welfare 132

CHAPTER XXI.

Bond obtained by Bothwell from the Nobles to promote his Marriage with the Queen—Mary discountenances his Suit and leaves Edinburgh—His next step that of a desperate man—He seizes her with an overpowering force and carries her Prisoner to Dunbar, shows her the Bond of the Nobles, and in the end overcomes her by "unleisum means"—Carries her Prisoner to Edinburgh and obtains a Judicial Declaration to protect him from the crime of Rape—A Marriage solemnised in Protestant form—Craig protests and denounces it from the Pulpit; and afterwards testifies in General Assembly that he stood alone in opposing the Marriage—French Ambassador's account of Mary's miserable state—Her threats of Suicide—Sir James Melville's account of these—Bothwell's precipitation—Marriage impossible when he carried the Queen off—Got himself divorced from his Wife while the Queen was his Prisoner 139

CHAPTER XXII.

Bothwell's Proceedings—Aimed at making himself absolute—Elizabeth's old dislike to him—Communication from English Court to Morton—Confederates abandon Bothwell—Melville corrupts Balfour, who held the Castle of Edinburgh—Balfour opens Bothwell's desk and seizes his Papers, including the Conspirators' Bond for the King's Murder—They now denounce Bothwell—He escapes, carrying the Queen with him—The hostile parties meet at Carberry Hill—The Conspirators offer obedience to the Queen if she will quit Bothwell—She does so, and they treat her as a Prisoner—Her miserable condition as described by an eyewitness—Her removal to Lochleven—The Ensign which they displayed before her—They compel her to sign a Renunciation of the Crown—Proclaim her infant Son King and Murray Regent—Murray's personal conduct to her while in prison 147

CHAPTER XXIII.

Page

Parliament convoked in the infant King's name—Notarial protest that the Queen was not a Prisoner—She protests that the renunciation of the Crown was invalid—Balfour holds the Bond for Darnley's Murder, and keeps the Castle—They buy him a second time—The Bond is burnt, and the Confederates then join in a Minute accusing the Queen of the Murder, and of having preconcerted her seizure by Bothwell—They had previously executed their Summons of Treason against him, charging him with having forced the Queen—Consequently two incongruous Acts in that Parliament—Lethington said they were like men in a boat on fire 156

CHAPTER XXIV.

Morton produces the celebrated SILVER CASKET LETTERS against the Queen—He afterwards got them back, and they ultimately disappeared—Their production before Queen Elizabeth—Mary never allowed to see them—Even copies withheld by Elizabeth—Pretended Promise of Marriage by Mary to Bothwell before Darnley's death ; in British Museum—EXAMINATION OF THEIR AUTHENTICITY—Proofs of Interpolation—Contrast with her style of language and thought—HER WAIL FOR THE DEAD 162

CHAPTER XXV.

Examination of the Silver Casket Papers continued—Opinions of Brantome and Ronsard—Her Sonnet, *L'Ire de Dieu*—The Judgment of the English Privy Council after examining all these Papers—Duke of Norfolk—Hume's mistake as to his opinion 178

CHAPTER XXVI.

Resumé of Events before Darnley's Death—Detailed account of Murray's proposal of Divorce—The Document misquoted by

Page

Mr. Froude—His excuse for Murray—Proposal of the Confederates to get Darnley convicted of Treason—Letters of the Spanish Ambassador—Murray's conduct—Archibald Douglas's Letter to Queen Mary while she was a Prisoner in England 188

CHAPTER XXVII.

General result of the History in reference to Mary's Guilt or Innocence—Special considerations which show the improbability of her having been concerned in Darnley's Death . 196

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Elizabeth's interference to procure a collusive acquittal of Archibald Douglas—Her Letter to King James—The private interview with Douglas—His expectation of being secured in the English Succession—Douglas's Letter to Walsingham—Master of Gray's Letter to Walsingham as to a Money-Bribe to the King for Douglas's Acquittal—King's interference at the Trial—Jury packed—Douglas Acquitted and sent as James's Ambassador to Elizabeth—Elizabeth's evasion of the conditions as to the Succession 201

CHAPTER XXIX.

Various schemes to get quit of Mary while a Prisoner in England—Randolph proposes Poison—Leicester's Letter as to a Warrant for cutting her off without Trial—Killigrew's negotiation with Morton for having her delivered into Scotland on Hostages that she should be put to Death within four hours—Killigrew's Secret Instructions—Act of Association ultimately passed to entrap her—Elizabeth pacts her chief Ministers under an Oath of Association aimed at her Prisoner—Sends them to try her—She declines their jurisdiction—They condemn her—King James instructs Archibald Douglas, his Ambassador, to protest—Archibald Douglas's Letter, treacherously warning him that he may endanger his own chance of Succession—He submits 205

CHAPTER XXX.

Page

Elizabeth signs the Warrant for Mary's Execution—Letter sent to Sir Amias Paulet, by Elizabeth's desire, to shorten Mary's life —His Letter refusing—The Warrant is Executed—Elizabeth throws the blame on Davidson, her Secretary—His Declaration, narrating fully all that passed between Elizabeth and him—Her hypocritical Letter to King James 211

CHAPTER XXXI.

Tragic end of the Leading Conspirators—Death-scenes of Elizabeth and Mary 219

APPENDIX.

I. Queen Elizabeth's instructions to Sadler as to the Lord James Stuart's enterprise toward Crown of Scotland—1559 225

II. The Lord James Stuart's letters to Norfolk and Cecil to keep Huntly's letters in store against him—1559-60 . 225

III. Address by the General Assembly to Mary, and her Answer —June 1565 226

IV. Mary Stuart's Instructions to her Ambassador, sent to Queen Elizabeth, in regard to the Religious troubles in France —1562 227

V. Part 1.—Her Letter to Elizabeth for Justice to her Merchants of Wigtown, plundered in Ireland—1564 . 229

Part 2.—Her Letter as to Merchants of Aberdeen, robbed by English Pirates—1564-5 231

VI. Mr. Randolph's Letter to Queen Elizabeth as to Mary's Secret Marriage to Darnley—16th July 1565 . 233

Page

VII. Letter, Elizabeth to Mary Stuart, denying that she countenanced Murray's Rebellion, and stating how she had repulsed him—29th October 1565 234

VIII. Drury to Cecil, as to Mary's fruitless efforts, seconded by Darnley, to induce Bothwell and others to go to Mass, and as to Bothwell's Marriage to Huntly's Sister—16th February 1565-6 235

IX. Mary Stuart's Narrative of Riccio's Murder—2d April 1566 236

X. Fragmentary Memoir by Mary Stuart as to her Marriage with Darnley, and as to Leicester, Murray, etc. . 243

XI. Cartel, Bothwell to Arran ; and Arran's Answer—1559 245

XII. Summons of Treason against Bothwell before Mary's Marriage to Darnley—2d May 1565 . . . 247

XIII. Randolph to Cecil as to Mary's displeasure at Bothwell's Return—His disrespectful words—Her request that he should not be received in England—15th March 1565 248

XIV. Letter, Morton to Forster as to Accusation by the King and Bothwell against Murray, Lethington, and others, as the devisers of Riccio's Slaughter, etc.—July 1566 250

XV. Earl of Murray's Will, made two months after Darnley's Death—2d April 1567 251

XVI. Part 1.—Letter, the Privy Council of Scotland to the Queen-Mother of France as to Darnley and Mary—8th October 1566 252

Part 2.—Translation of the French Ambassador's Letter as to Darnley and Mary, and as to his conversations with Darnley—The conference of King and Queen before Privy Council—His conduct, and his fear of being affronted by Elizabeth's Ambassador at the Baptism—17th October 1566 257

XVII. Extracts from old MS. in British Museum, containing a recital of Murray's schemes and conduct, down to Mary's escape from Lochleven 261

Page

XVIII. Part 1.—List of such as are to be entertained in Scotland with Pensions out of England; from original in British Museum 263

Part 2.—Killigrew to Lord Burghley as to Persons to be considered with Pensions, and as to how Elizabeth might "oversee" the murders—15th March 1573 . 264

XIX. Evidence of Huntly and Argyle touching the Murder of the King of Scots, with Murray's Answer (pasted on the back); in British Museum 265

XX. Letter, the Master of Gray to Walsingham, as to Archibald Douglas's Trial; that the King hath "condescended to all things;" and desiring to have £1000 sent of the bribe promised—17th May 1586 . . . 269

XXI. Extracts from Mary Stuart's Will . . . 270

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

AND REPLY TO MR. FROUDE.

Mr. Froude, conscious that the case against Mary Stuart depends on the celebrated casket letters, gave a pledge that in the continuation of his *History* he should fully examine and establish their authenticity. He has not redeemed his pledge. He now rests, in substance, on an appeal to contemporary opinion—not always a reliable guide in historical questions, least so in a case which was never openly tried; and as to writings which were carefully withheld from the inspection of the person in whose handwriting they were said to be—

"I accept them as genuine" (he says in his new volumes) "because they were submitted to the scrutiny of almost the entire English peerage, and especially to those among the peers who were most interested in discovering them to be forged, and *by them admitted to be indisputably in the handwriting of the Queen of Scots;* because the letters in the text especially refer to conversations with Lord Huntly, who was then and always one of Mary Stuart's truest adherents—conversations which he could have denied had they been false, and which he never did deny; because their contents were confirmed in every particular unfavourable to the Queen by a Catholic informant of the Spanish ambassador,

who hurried from the spot to London immediately after the final catastrophe for which they prepared the way; and lastly, because there is no ground whatever to doubt the genuineness of the entire set of the casket letters, except such as arises from the hardy and long-continued, but entirely baseless denial of interested or sentimental partisans."[1]

He also says that Huntly and Argyll "published a statement in which they accused Murray of having been privy to the murder, yet *they said nothing about a forgery of the letters*, which, if real, *they could not but have known;* and had they been able to prove, had they been able even plausibly to assert, that there had been foul play against the Queen, the whole of Europe would at once have declared on her side."[2]

This perilling of his case on the testimony of Huntly and Argyll is singularly unfortunate for Mr. Froude. "Huntly" and "Argyll" are the foremost signatures to the solemn declaration of thirty-five peers and prelates of Scotland in regard to these papers, that "the same are devised by themselves" (the Queen's accusers) "in some principal and substantious clauses."[3]

"Almost the entire English peerage admitted them to be indisputably in the handwriting of the Queen of Scots." Let us see what foundation there is for this assertion. Elizabeth, whom Mr. Froude (in his incoherent account of the conferences on this subject) would represent as morbidly anxious to suppress the charge, caused these letters to be shown to the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Wor-

[1] Froude, ix. 58. [2] *Ib.* ix. 203.

[3] This declaration is printed by Goodall, ii. 361.

cester, Huntingdon, and Warwick (the English peerage!) "*specially to keep the same secret to themselves.*" There are two minutes of this proceeding, differing from each other, both altered and interlined by Mary Stuart's mortal enemy, Cecil.[1] These contain all that we know of the matter. The "writings lying all together upon the council-table, the same were, one after another, showed rather by hap, as the same did ly upon the table, than with any choice made, as by the nature thereof, *if time had so served,* might have been."[2] The Lords declared beforehand that they would not "form any final opinion or determination."[3] The papers "were compared for the manner of writing and fashion of orthography" with other letters produced by Elizabeth and Cecil, "in collation whereof," writes Cecil parenthetically, "no difference was found."[4] This incidental reference in Cecil's manipulated minute to a similarity of handwriting, noticed on a preliminary examination so obviously perfunctory, not by men practised in such inquiries, but by persons who were not even prepared to look for forged passages being interwoven with true,[5] is the whole authority for Mr. Froude's statement. This passed in December 1568. In the following month the Privy Council of England

[1] Journal, 14th and 15th December 1568; Goodall, ii. 247, 254.

[2] Goodall, ii. 259.

[3] *Ib.* 255.

[4] *Ib.* ii. 256.

[5] See p. 171 of this volume.

pronounced the unanimous verdict by which, without hearing a defence, they discredited the case against Mary Stuart,[1]—which solemn verdict Mr. Froude treats as of no account whatever.

"Their contents were confirmed in every particular unfavorable to the Queen by a Catholic informant," whose story Mr. Froude prudently gives *in Spanish*.[2] The casket papers extend in Anderson's edition to forty-one pages of printed quarto. Their confirmation "in every particular" is quoted by Mr. Froude in little more than as many Spanish words. Wonderful condensation of language and thought! Wonderful prescience, also! Some of the letters could not then have been in existence. Many of the facts to which they were intended to give a criminating colour had not even occurred. It was never pretended that these papers were found before the end of June; the date which Mr. Froude gives for this confirmation of their every particular is the first of the previous March! Here is the passage which Mr. Froude quotes as containing this confirmation; but we add a translation :—

"Por las quales parece que induce sospecha de haber sabido o permitido la Reyna este tra-	For which suspicion seems to be excited that the Queen knew or allowed this treaty ;[3]

[1] See pp. 185, 186, of this volume. [2] Froude, ix. 18.

[3] The word "tratado" signifies treaty, but might possibly be used for transaction if the context (which Mr. Froude has not given) requires that meaning.

tado ; y aun apuntandole que me dixese lo que le parecia conforme a lo que el habia visto y colegido, si la Reyna tenia culpa dello, aunque no la condeñó de palabra no la salbo nada" (De Silva to Philip, March 1, 1567 ; Froude, ix. 18).

and I urging him to tell me his impression, according to what he had seen and gathered, if the Queen was to blame for it, he neither expressly condemned nor absolved her (De Silva to Philip, March 1 1567 ; Froude, ix. 18).

What treaty ? Which Queen ? And where is the confirmation of the casket letters ? Probably the previous part of the despatch would tell of the placards accusing the queen, which were stuck up in Edinburgh immediately after Darnley's death ; and this, or something like it, may be what is referred to in the passage which Mr. Froude quotes. But if the despatch had really contained any facts telling against Mary Stuart, he was not very likely to have left them out. At all events, this passage, which he has taken from the Spanish records at Simancas, and has made obscure by withholding its context, is all that he gives for the confirmation he speaks of. But he tells that this " Catholic informant" was Moret, the ambassador of Savoy, and there is fortunately in existence a very full report of Moret's observations and views, *dated a fortnight later.* It is contained in a despatch from the papal nuncio, is printed at great length by Count Labanoff, contains most interesting details as to the King's death (on which the narrative of our own text is in part founded), and is *altogether inconsistent with the representation*

now made by Mr. Froude as proceeding from Moret.[1] On the contrary, it bears that Murray was suspected of designs on his sister's life and kingdom.

But Mr. Froude takes great liberties with his Spanish authorities. To convey the idea that Mary Stuart was looked upon as unworthy, he gives the following as a translation of another Spanish despatch :—

"It would require some skill to bring his Majesty (Philip of Spain) to hold out a hand to her; but he was a great prince, and in the service of God, and considering the present condition of the world, his Majesty *might overlook her faults, and accept her as sound.*"[2]

There is no such imputation or insinuation in the original. Its words are :—

"Aunque puede tener, alguna arte esto, para hacer salir á su Majestad à ayudarla, arte es que paresce que su Majestad puede pasarla y tomárla por la buena pues es en el servicio de Dios y bien de las materias que hoy se tratan en el mundo. Su Majestad es Catolico y magnanimo Principe," etc.

The meaning is, that although some art may have been used to induce his Majesty to support her, it is an art which he might take in good part as in God's service, and useful for the matters then treated of in the

[1] Papal nuncio to Grand Duke of Tuscany, 16th March 1567, Archives de Medici.

[2] Froude, ix. 299.

world. He was a Catholic and magnanimous prince, etc.

Mr Froude has made no attempt to explain his numerous blunders, already shown in this volume, some ludicrous, others of a very grave character,[1] nor has he even acknowledged or corrected them. But he has quoted one of the forged letters at length, and has thus brought into prominence an anachronism, not hitherto made the subject of remark, which of itself seems decisive against the authenticity of the paper. This letter was exhibited as written by the Queen to Bothwell in regard to his preparations for carrying her off, ostensibly by force, to Dunbar. Nothing is more certain than that Bothwell was then undivorced from his wife, the Earl of Huntly's sister;[2] indeed, that the process of divorce was begun during Mary's subsequent captivity at Dunbar. But in this letter she is made to refer to Huntly as "your" (Bothwell's) "brother-in-law THAT WAS,"[3] showing plainly that the letter was concocted after the divorce, though purporting to have been written to arrange the prior seizure of the Queen!

Speaking of Mary Stuart in 1567, Mr. Froude says her passions "had dragged her down to the level of a

[1] See pp. 98, 99 and note; p. 102 and note; 190 and notes; 191; 192, note; 83, note; 198, etc.

[2] See p. 145 of this volume, and Diurnal quoted in note to p. 143.

[3] Froude, ix. 60.

brute,"[1] "infernal is not too hard an epithet" for her.[2] He does not appear to see how severely his violent detraction is rebuked by the facts which he afterwards chronicles, that in 1569 "France already had its eye on her as a fit match, could she escape, for the Duke of Anjou"[3]—that Don John of Austria was once more talked of as her suitor.[4]—and that "the stream ran so violently that on the 27th of August a vote was carried in full council" (the Privy Council of England) "for the settlement of the succession by the marriage of the Queen of Scots to some English nobleman. Many peers," (according to Don Guerau) "the greatest in the land," set their hands to a "bond to stand by Norfolk in carrying the resolution into effect."[5] Norfolk—himself the candidate for her hand—said that Elizabeth "dare not refuse—all the peers except a very few were determined to have it so."[6]

Our author, with charming credulity, adopts and characteristically embellishes the ridiculous tales which were extorted from Bothwell's French page, Nicholas Hubert, commonly called Paris. The Queen left her husband at midnight. "She slept soundly," says Mr. Froude, and when Paris went to announce the King's murder, the windows were still closed. The *room was already hung with black*, and lighted with candles. She her-

[1] Froude, ix. 44. [2] *Ib.* ix. 118.
[3] *Ib.* ix. 478. [4] *Ib.* ix. 373.
[5] *Ib.* ix. 471. [6] *Ib.* ix. 472.

self was breakfasting in bed, eating composedly, as Paris observed, a new-laid egg."[1] A sound sleep, indeed; not disturbed by the explosion at Kirk of Field, which, if guilty, she must have expected, nor even by nailing up the black hangings, which a woman who was not a fool is here supposed to have ordered in anticipation of her husband's murder!—as if to prepare evidence against herself; evidence which, if it had been true, must have been notorious, but which was never heard of till "the boots" were applied to poor Paris more than two years afterwards. How different from Clernault's report: "It may be imagined in what distress this poor Princess was when the dreadful event was made known to her, especially since it occurred when her Majesty and her husband had come to a better understanding. Clernault left her in such affliction that he thought her the most unfortunate of queens."[2] Even Robertson acknowledges that the declarations which are called by the name of Paris "contain some improbable circumstances," and that "the fear of death, the violence of torture, and the desire of pleasing those in whose power he was, tempted him, perhaps, to feign some circumstances and to exaggerate others."[3] "He signed it," says Mr. Froude, "and was then executed,

[1] Froude, ix. 5.

[2] See this volume, p. 109, note; also 107, note.

[3] Robertson's Dissertation on King Henry's murder.

that there might be no retractation or contradiction. The haste and the concealment were intended merely to baffle Elizabeth, who, it was feared, would attempt to get hold of him *and suppress his evidence!*"[1] Elizabeth suppress his evidence! She was not slow to use it. How was his hurried death needed to hinder the suppression of evidence which they had taken in writing for what it was worth? She told De Silva that the Queen of Scots "had so many friends" (in England), "that to declare her innocence[2] would be perilous to the country and to (Elizabeth) herself. Her acquittal should be so contrived as to leave a doubt."—And what was the date of this acknowledged deed of the "stainless Murray?" The same month of August 1569, in which he and Elizabeth were trembling on their seats, because even the Privy Council of England had become unruly, and voted for the recognition of Mary Stuart as heiress of the English crown, and for her marriage to Norfolk.

The French of some parts of Paris' declaration is much like the French of the forged passages in the casket letters. To take a decisive example: Paris,

[1] Froude, ix. 4, note.

[2] "Si se declarabo su innocencia" (De Silva's letter, quoted by Froude, ix. 271). Mr. Froude translates these words "to declare her innocent," instead of *to declare her innocence*, the words actually used by Elizabeth implying her consciousness of Mary's innocence, while disclosing the design to leave her under suspicion.

in speaking of the Queen's chamber at Kirk of Field being right under (that is, immediately below) the King's, is twice over represented as using the words "*droict* soubz la chambre du Roy," "*droit* soubz le lict du Roy,"—blunders so gross that no Frenchman could have made them. It seems almost impossible to touch the evidences which were brought against the Queen without detecting traces of transparent fraud.

Mr. Froude attempts to support his statement as to the English peerage by a special and repeated assurance that the greatest nobleman in England, the Duke of Norfolk, had no doubt that the letters were genuine, and that the Queen of Scots was guilty. We have already shown that Norfolk risked his life at his trial to give an emphatic denial to this imputation.[1] But Mr. Froude coolly says "the silence of Norfolk at this, the supreme moment of his own fate and Mary Stuart's, would be proof sufficient against her."[2] It would indeed have been difficult, if Norfolk had believed her so degraded, to account for his having become, with consent of his peers, the suitor of Mary Stuart, when her fortunes were at the lowest ebb, and herself a prisoner. But Mr. Froude thinks it enough to say, with a fine touch of unconscious simplicity, that "she was not likely to repeat a proceeding the consequences of which had been so inconvenient to her!"[3]

[1] P. 186 of this volume, note 2. [2] Froude, x. 327.
[3] *Ib.* ix. 280.

This brings us to a matter which it is painful to touch. We had already noticed, perhaps too gently, a flagrant instance of words being put by Mr. Froude into Mary Stuart's mouth, to give a colour to assertions for which he had no proof.[1]

In like manner he refers to a despatch of Norfolk[2] enclosing extracts from the casket letters, and leaving it to Elizabeth to say whether, if they were genuine, "*which he and his companions believed them to be,*" there could be any doubt of the Queen of Scot's guilt. Mr. Froude gives with inverted commas the words in italics as a quotation from Norfolk's despatch. THERE ARE NO SUCH WORDS IN IT, nor anything like them. On the contrary, whenever the letters are referred to in it, they are spoken of with marked suspicion—"of her own hand, *as they say;*" "written, *as they say,* with her own hand;" and again, "*if* the said letters be written with her own hand."[3] Nor was it possible for Norfolk at that time to have expressed such an opinion, because the extracts which he transmits with his despatch show that he had seen only the Scotch copies, not the pretended originals. Among his quotations he gives the remarkable passage, "mak gude watch that the bird

[1] P. 190 of this volume. [2] Froude, ix. 292.

[3] See the despatch in Anderson (whose copy Mr. Froude professes to quote from), vol.i v. part ii. p. 58. It is also in Goodall, ii. p. 139. The original despatch is in the Cotton Library, and gives no warrant for Mr. Froude's quotation.

escape not out of the cage,"[1] which the slightest inspection of the French would have shown to be fraudulent.[2]

Similar in character and purpose, though of comparative unimportance, is a quotation relating to Murray. It occurs in the sarcastic passage in Throkmorton's letter as to Murray inveighing "against the tragedy and the players therein, *so little like he hath to horrible sins.*"[3] Mr. Froude converts the sneer into a certificate of character, and quotes it as "none showed so little liking to such horrible sins."[4]

Akin to these, perhaps worse,—Mr. Froude, in his zeal to make out a case against the Queen, has found it necessary to improve on the work of the forgers. They had put down as proceeding from her pen the common phrase of resolute resistance—

> "The place shall hold unto the death."
> "Ceste forteresse sera conservée jusques à la mort."
> "Præsidium ad mortem usque custodietur."[5]

Mr. Froude alters it to—

> "The *plan* shall hold to the death;"[6]

and perverts it into a declared scheme for the King's murder.

[1] See the extracts in Goodall ii., 148-150.

[2] See p. 180 of this volume; also note 2 on that page. See also p. 106.

[3] See p. 154 of this volume, note 1.

[4] Froude, ix. 155.

[5] Goodall, ii. 12.

[6] Froude, viii. 358.

When Mr. Froude shall have given a satisfactory answer to these observations, and to those on the substance of the letters which are contained in the 24th and 25th chapters of this volume, it will be quite time enough for him to complain that he has nothing to meet except "hardy and baseless denials."

It is a pleasure to turn from such specimens of spurious history to the admirable French work by Professor Wiesener, too little known in England. M. Wiesener has made a valuable contribution to the history of Mary Stuart. He pronounces the French of the casket letters wretched, such as could not have been written by a person educated in France. "They abound," he says, "in blunders equally coarse and ridiculous, both in language and in meaning;" "they are but parts of a huge system of calumny." He also satisfactorily shows that the admission made in this volume[1] in regard to Mary Stuart having signed the League against the Protestants is an error. That admission was made on the evidence of a despatch by Randolph; But the distinguished Professor of History has shown that it was contradicted by a later despatch :—

"Se retracte le 14 du meme mois, en disant que ce pacte est entre les mains de la reine, *mais qu'elle n'a pas encore adhéré.*"

[1] P. 46.

He also quotes the following conclusive passage on this subject from the despatch written after Darnley's death by the Bishop of Mondovi, the papal legate to Scotland :[1]—

"If the Queen had done as was proposed, and urged on her (in regard to the League) with the promise of all succour necessary for her objects, she would at this time have found herself wholly mistress of her kingdom, in a position to establish fully the Holy Catholic faith. *But she would never listen to it,* though the Bishop of Dunblane and Father Edmond (Jesuit) were sent to determine her to embrace this most wise enterprise."

Thus is taken away the worst thing that seemed to remain in Mary's true history.

[1] 16th March 1567, Archives de Medici.

MARY STUART.

CHAPTER I.

THREE centuries ago, a French fleet sailed up the Firth of Clyde, past Lochryan, Ailsa, Arran, and the Cumbraes, and cast anchor at Dumbarton. It took on board a little girl, six years of age—a merry creature who had not a care in the world—hoisted the flag of Scotland, and bore her away to the coast of France. The policy, perhaps the fate, of England, France, and Scotland, hung on that voyage. Before she was three months old intrigue had been busily at work to secure that little lady's hand; and long ere the time we now speak of, much blood—Scotch, English, and French—had been shed to determine who should be her husband.

There passed with her to France, in the same ship, a stripling of seventeen, her illegitimate brother, who, though incapable of inheritance, was brought up in the most intimate family intercourse with her: young enough to engage the sisterly affection of her warm heart, old enough to be already her trusted counsellor and guide. His life was to be a continued betrayal of her confidence. But whatever wild thoughts may have

passed through his busy brain, neither of them could have dreamed in those early days of the frightful tragedies in which they were to become the chief actors. In the yet distant future he was to usurp her place and power, she to become his miserable prisoner ; and it was all to end at last in his being shot down, without law, at the summit of his greatness, and in her being doomed to die, under the forms of law, on an English scaffold. Yet, though their hearts were light on this summer voyage, it was not without its dangers. An English fleet watched to intercept them, and one of their galleys was taken; but they escaped, and were safely landed in France.

Twelve years later, a fleet sailed from sunny France, again bearing the same girl, now budding towards womanhood. It steered for the Firth of Forth. There is no laughter now. Her first great sorrow has come upon her early. She is deeply clothed in mourning—a widow at eighteen. Again an English fleet watched to intercept her. Again she escaped narrowly, losing one of her vessels. She has been Queen of France. One blow has deprived her of a husband and a crown. She claims to be Queen of England. That claim rests on strong grounds of law. It is to be the dream of her life, and she is never to realise it. She is the acknowledged Queen of Scotland ; but she lands on her native shore with sad forebodings and a heavy heart. No one has ever charged her with having misconducted herself before that time; yet such was the distracted state of her country, such the weakness of her autho-

rity, that she said, before she set out on this voyage "Perhaps it were better for me to die than to live."

Less than six busy years of troubled government and we see her again—on the Firth of Solway. She has been despoiled of her Scottish crown. She is flying for her life in a fishing-boat. "For ninety miles" (she writes) "I rode across the country without lighting or drawing bridle; slept on the bare floor; no food but oatmeal; without the company of a female; not daring to travel except by stealth at night." And now the die is cast, and in spite of many warnings she this time throws herself on the generosity of England.

Then follow nineteen years of bitter captivity—

> Now blooms the lily by the bank,
> The primrose on the brae;
> The hawthorn's budding in the glen,
> And milk-white is the slae;
> The meanest hind in fair Scotland
> May rove their sweets amang;
> But I, the Queen o' a' Scotland,
> Maun lie in prison strang.

At last we see a long hall in the old castle of Fotheringay: a platform laid with black—the actors and spectators all clothed in black. There comes in, unsupported, to die, a lady of noble presence. She has been wickedly denied the aid of her spiritual comforter, and, alone with God, has administered to herself the last sacrament of her religion, without the blessing or counsel of a minister. Even her latest moments are disturbed by theological dispute. But she is calm and resigned to God's will. She lays her head on the block.

The executioner strikes and makes a ghastly wound. She does not even stir. He strikes again, but his work is incomplete ; and with a third blow the life and sorrows of Mary Stuart are brought to an end.

It is one of the great problems of history, whether these terrible calamities were brought upon her by her own wickedness or by the contrivance of others.

CHAPTER II.

MARY STUART came to the throne when six days old,[1] and the battle of intrigue began at once. The King of England coveted her kingdom. The King of France longed for it, as a thorn in the side of his English enemies. Both coloured their designs by religion. Henry of England sought to propitiate the Reformers. His royal brother of France stood by the adherents of Rome. —Two great Scottish houses—Lennox and Hamilton—led the domestic contest. Hamilton was the next heir to the Scottish throne, and now became Regent. Henry for a time won him to his interest by the prospect of a family alliance. He promised the hand of his daughter, the Princess Elizabeth (she who afterwards became the famous Queen of England), to Hamilton's son. Gained by this lure, the Regent contracted his young ward, Mary Stuart, a child in the cradle, to Henry's only son, Edward, Prince of Wales, then in his sixth year; and the policy of all, except France, was to have united the two crowns in the persons of these royal children. But Henry got a secret hint from the Continent that Hamilton was playing false; that he was counselled by France to promise the child, but not to part with her custody, so that when she grew up she could withdraw.

[1] Born 8th December 1542.

The Regent vacillated sadly, now in favour of England, now of France. He avowed himself a Protestant, but returned to the Romish faith, persecuted the Reformers, and again, at the end of many years, did public penance on the demand of Knox for his tergiversation. Henry probably thought that Hamilton's price was too high; so he was slow to fulfil his promise of the Princess. Lennox was less exacting. He, too, was willing to sell his country for a wife, but he was content with Henry's niece, who had four lives between her and the English crown. He agreed that England should have a Protectorate over Scotland, and bargained that he should rule the country in England's name.

Hamilton and the Scottish Parliament withdrew from the projected marriage of Mary Stuart with Prince Edward. The Cardinal (Beaton) and the Church in Scotland had become alarmed. They dexterously raised the cry of national independence. Lennox's engagement, which would have made Scotland an English province, roused the patriotic feelings of the country, and after much bloodshed Henry's great scheme terminated in failure. Lennox suffered forfeiture as a traitor, and was expatriated. Mary Stuart was promised in marriage to the heir of France, and France guaranteed to Hamilton his right to succeed after Mary to the Scottish throne.

These were the circumstances under which Mary was sent to France in her childhood.[1] She was there brought up, not among the dissipations of a court, as

[1] 7th August 1548.

has been often said, but in the seclusion of a nunnery,[1] where she remained till she was married. She there imbibed that affection for the Church of Rome which was unwavering till death. At sixteen she was wedded to Francis, the Dauphin;[2] and that their union might embrace the people a Royal Act was issued by which all natives of Scotland were naturalised in France. There were great public rejoicings in Scotland on the marriage, and the huge cannon *Mons Meg* was employed to signalise the event. There is a charge in the public accounts of that date "for raising of Mons forth of her lair to be schote, and for finding and carrying her bullet, after she was schote, fra Wardie Muir to the Castle of Edinburgh." Wardie Muir is nearly two miles from the Castle; so that, even according to modern notions, the range of this old national gun was by no means despicable.

A few weeks before the marriage the unsuspicious young Queen was beguiled by her uncles, the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise, into granting two deeds of tremendous import[3]—one mortgaging the kingdom of Scotland and its revenues to the French king for a million of pieces of gold, as the costs which he had incurred in her education and the protection of her realm; the other, still more audacious, settling upon him and his heirs, in absolute right, the crown of Scotland and her whole claims on the

[1] Ellis, 1st series, vol. ii. p. 252. [2] 24th April 1558.

[3] Labanoff, vol. i. pp. 50 and 52. These deeds are dated 4th April 1558.

crown of England. These portentous deeds threatened Europe with the ultimate annexation of England, Scotland, and Ireland to the kingdom of France. Their existence was a great state secret. Had they come into operation they would have cost oceans of blood. But happily they contained a condition that they should not take effect unless Mary should die childless; and as she left a son the danger eventually vanished.

John Knox was not satisfied with Mary's French marriage, though he knew nothing of the secret settlement of the crown. His experience of queens had not been encouraging. He had been hunted out of England by Mary Tudor.[1] He had come into collision with Mary of Guise, the Queen Dowager of Scotland, of whom he has recorded that "the crown on her head was as seemly a sight as a saddle on the back of ane unruly cow;" and he was by no means well affected towards her daughter Mary Stuart. So he issued, in this year, at Geneva, his "Blast against the Regiment of Women." It is a very curious work. He says in it—

"This monstriferous empire of women, among all enormities that this day do abound upon the face of the whole earth, is most detestable and damnable. Even men subject to the counsel or empire of their wives are unworthy of all public office." This was one of John's hobbies, and he rode it to death. But with what power he urges it: "No man ever saw a lion stoop before a lioness!"

[1] 1558. She died on 17th November of that year, and was succeeded by her sister Queen Elizabeth.

CHAPTER III.

MARY STUART, on the death of her father-in-law,[1] became Queen of France, and Francis, her husband, King. The Scottish Parliament had previously voted him the matrimonial crown. Their reign was short in France and uneasy in Scotland. The old disturbances, fomented as before by English influence, broke out from time to time among the Scottish nobles, and soon became alarming. That dread of foreign influence which had defeated Henry was now roused against France, for Mary's father-in-law, during her childhood, had planted Frenchmen in some chief places of power in her native kingdom. The war of creeds, too, had gone on, and as the parties became more equally matched their struggle grew more embittered. An insurrection of the most alarming character broke out in 1559.

Elizabeth had succeeded to the English throne, and her jealousy was roused to the highest pitch on learning that Francis and Mary now quartered the arms of England with their own. This was an assertion of Mary's prior title to the English crown. She was then a girl of seventeen, acting under the control of others. But it would be difficult to say whether the claim

[1] 10th July 1559.

which was thus put forward, or her adherence to the church in which she was educated, contributed more to her eventual downfall.

Elizabeth, at the desire of her father, Henry VIII., had been declared illegitimate by an Act of the English Parliament, and that Act had never been repealed. But Henry had subsequently procured another Act, by which, without changing her status of illegitimacy, the crown was by the will of the three Estates settled upon her. If Elizabeth was incapable of succession, Mary Stuart, who was descended from Henry VII., was the nearest heir to the English crown. Elizabeth stood on a parliamentary title, Mary on legitimacy. The history and struggles of a later time have settled that, by the constitution of England, Elizabeth had the better claim. But that was far from being recognised in her own day. The uncertainty of her title kept her anxious and miserable all her life. And when, on her accession, Mary and her husband asserted their claim, her indignation was unbounded.

The insurrection in Scotland had among its leaders the Prior of St. Andrews. He was the Lord James Stuart, the illegitimate brother of his Queen. Even thus early he had conceived ideas of usurping the government. Knox had made a proposition of that kind to Elizabeth's ministers,[1] and there exists an un-

[1] Croft's letter to Cecil, 3d August 1559 (State Paper Office) gives particulars of a secret interview with Knox, who said the Protestants would leave the French and join the English, and proposed that the government of Scotland should be altered; the

published letter of Cecil, her chief counsellor (at that time acting as ambassador in Scotland), in which he says to Elizabeth herself: "The Lord James is not unlike to be a king soon." [1]

Hamilton had been rewarded by France for his services with the dukedom of Chatelherault, which is still an appanage of his house. But he had no doubt got a hint of the secret settlement of the crown by which the King of France had broken his guarantee of the succession to him. He changed sides, and joined the insurgents. This disconcerted the scheme in favour of the Lord James, and indeed led to its abandonment for a time, for if Mary had been then deposed, it would have been impossible to pass over the claims of the lawful heir of the throne—the now Protestant duke.

The insurgents made head, but their forces could scarcely be kept together for want of money. Queen Elizabeth revenged herself for Mary's claim on her crown by sending them secret aid.[2] She wrote the instructions with her own hand. A convoy of treasure, furnished by her, was on its way from Berwick to

Queen of England to have some one in Scotland to advise them; Arran (Hamilton's son) to be conveyed to England, and if he was misliked, the Prior of St. Andrews to be thought of.

[1] Cecil to Queen Elizabeth, 19th June 1560 (State Paper Office). See also Appendix hereto, No. I.

[2] Elizabeth, 7th August 1559, sent Sadleir authority "to practise with any manner of persons in Scotland," and secretly to reward them with such sums as he should think meet (Ellis' Original Letters, 3d series, vol. iii. pp. 333-359).

Edinburgh, when James, Earl of Bothwell, swooped down upon it, and carried it off in triumph. The blow was a severe one, and reduced the insurgents to great extremities. Elizabeth remembered it against Bothwell till the last day of his life. But she was not yet prepared for open hostilities, and when the Queen Dowager complained of her secret interference, she wrote back, "I marvel much that your Majesty makes no surer account of my honour!"[1]

The Earl of Huntly had been slow to join the insurgents. He was the most powerful nobleman in the north. Besides his own estates, he held, by favour of the crown, the vast earldoms of Murray and of Mar. The Lord James entered into communication with him, and Huntly was at last induced to write letters to Queen Elizabeth, and to Cecil her minister, containing matter which involved him in treason.[2] These letters were written with the knowledge, indeed on the persuasion, of the Lord James. On the very next day, before they could have reached their destination, he wrote to Cecil and the Duke of Norfolk telling them that Huntly was about to join, and adding the treacherous suggestion that his letters should be "kept in store for all adventures."[3]

Huntly's accession added greatly to the strength of

[1] State Paper Office, 23d November 1559.

[2] Huntly to Queen Elizabeth, 7th March 1560; do. to Cecil, same day; do. to Lethington, same day (State Paper Office).

[3] Lord James Stuart to Duke of Norfolk, 8th March 1560, and to Cecil same day (State Paper Office). See Appendix hereto, No. II.

the insurgents; and Elizabeth at last sent an army to their relief, blocked up the Firth of Forth with her fleet, and joined them in besieging and finally taking Leith. By the treaty then made Mary and her husband were to relinquish their rivalry with Elizabeth for the immediate possession of the English crown; but through the contrivance of Cecil (Elizabeth's ambassador) the articles were so expressed as to be capable of implying also a total renunciation of Mary's right of succession, even if Elizabeth should die childless. This ambiguity became a fruitful source of misunderstanding between the two queens. It never was set right, and for that reason the treaty itself was never ratified, though its ratification was often demanded by Elizabeth with threats of war.

The Parliament of Scotland met soon after hostilities ceased: Mary was still in France, and no representative of the Crown attended to sanction its proceedings. It passed Acts abolishing the jurisdiction of the Pope, and establishing the *Confession of Faith* as the true doctrine of the Church of Scotland. These important Acts, though they did not receive the formal assent of the Crown, were acquiesced in by Mary, and were enforced by law during the whole of her reign. That Parliament passed another Act of a more questionable character, prohibiting the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion as symbolised by the mass, under the pain of confiscation for the first offence, banishment for the second, and death for the third. On this point Mary skilfully chose her battle-ground. While still in France she

announced her views on the subject in a remarkable conversation with the English ambassador: "I mean," she said, "to constrain none of my subjects, and I trust they shall have no support to constrain me."[1] Henceforward she stood up, as well as she could, for freedom of opinion.

The sudden death of Mary's husband,[2] the young King of France, which followed close on these events, totally changed everything. Mary at once lost the crown of France, and the fierce jealousies of her subjects against French interference ceased for ever.

[1] Bell, 1-92; Keith (Spott.), 2-34. [2] 5th December 1560.

CHAPTER IV.

The Lord James, who had been the soul of the revolt against the young Queen's authority, proceeded to France to confer with her on the altered state of affairs.[1] He went by way of London, and concerted his measures with the English ministers. He probably armed himself with the treasonable letters which Huntly had written to the English queen and government—at all events he had the address, in one way or other, to persuade his royal sister that Huntly was a chief conspirator against her crown and government, and that he himself was wholly at her devotion. Her affection for her brother, her position in France, which had now become irksome, and her wish to conciliate her subjects, all combined to second his efforts. He quickly gained the position of her chief counsellor, and carried back with him to Scotland her full commission and authority.

Mary had become anxious to return to her native country, and applied to "her dearest sister and cousin" Elizabeth, for an assurance that she might pass the seas unmolested by the English fleets. And here we get a peep behind the scenes. The Lord James's scheme

[1] 1561.

now seems to have been to keep her in France that he might rule in her name. And there remains among the state papers in London a narrative by the English ambassador of a conference which he had with Mary's faithful counsellor, the Lord James, and his allies the Earl of Morton (who was the Lord James's brother-uterine) and Maitland of Lethington. He says, "I have shown your honour's letters unto the Lord James, Lord Morton, Lord Lethington. They wish, as your honour doth, that she might be staid yet for a space, and if it were not for their obedience' sake, some of them care not though they never saw her face." . . . "They repose themselves upon the Queen's majesty our sovereign's favour and support."[1] These were now Mary's chief and confidential ministers. Lethington actually wrote to Cecil expressing his opposition to her return, and hinting that her coming back might lead to "wonderful tragedies."

Elizabeth uncourteously refused the safe conduct which Mary had requested, and sent out her ships in all directions on the pretence of watching for pirates, but with the intention of intercepting her Scottish sister and conveying her to England. And there can be little doubt that, if she had succeeded, Mary's imprisonment in England, and the Lord James's seizure of the government, would have been anticipated by a number of years.

Mary escaped the English fleets in a fog, and landed safely in Scotland. Elizabeth had the assurance to

[1] Robertson, Appendix No. 5, p. 241.

send her an ambassador to congratulate her on her safe arrival in her native kingdom, and Mary's policy led her to accept the congratulation as sincere.

Before leaving France she stipulated that she should have the personal exercise of her own religion; but no sooner did she attempt to have mass celebrated in her private chapel at Holyrood than a riot broke out, and her chaplains were threatened with death. She nevertheless issued a proclamation prohibiting any attempt to disturb the Protestant order of religion which she "found publicly standing on her arrival."[1] And after much angry discussion her personal claim to the exercise of her own religion was acquiesced in on the one hand, and she on the other submitted to the enforcement throughout Scotland of the informal law against the mass.

Things went on smoothly for a considerable time. The Lord James was her chief minister, and her privy counsellors were wholly Protestant. But modern research has disclosed the fact, though it was unknown then, that he and almost all of them were in the secret pay of Elizabeth, and so continued during the whole of Mary's reign.

The Lord James signalised the commencement of his administration by a proceeding of wholesome vigour, which quelled the turbulence and marauding of the Borders; and having thus tried and consolidated his strength, he proceeded to carry out his long-cherished design against Huntly.

[1] 25th August 1561. Knox, ii. 272.

He and Huntly had united, at the close of the revolt, in a compact with the other lords to stand by one another for their mutual protection. The ink was scarcely dry before he entered into a secret league with Argyle and Athole "to bridle Huntly."[1] The opportunity had now come for its execution. Marching an army into the Highlands, he called on Huntly to present himself before the Queen, interpreted his absence into rebellion, summoned his castles to surrender, and beat him down in fight at Corrichie. Huntly was taken prisoner, and suddenly fell from his horse, stark dead, without a blow or wound. His eldest son was also taken prisoner. The Lord James had him beheaded at Aberdeen, and cruelly compelled the Queen to witness the execution, because she was supposed to have had some favour to the unfortunate young man, and he was of her own creed. Lord James now confiscated Huntly's vast estates, and obtained for himself the Earldom of Murray and its immense territories, which the family of Huntly had hitherto possessed from the crown, and for which he had succeeded in procuring a writing from the Queen while living in ostensible friendship with the man whom he had doomed to ruin. We are told by Keith[2] that he had actually applied for it on his first visit to the Queen in France; and the Privy Seal Register shows

[1] Randolph's letter to Cecil, 23d September 1560; also 7th September 1560.

[2] Keith (Spott.), vol. ii. p. 22. See also Chalmers, vol. i. pp. 78 and 80; Privy Seal Register, xxxi. 45, 46.

that he had obtained an inchoate[1] grant of the earldom six months before he succeeded in driving Huntly into rebellion.—Henceforth the Lord James is known in history as the EARL OF MURRAY.

[1] Grants of crown lands under the Privy Seal were technically imperfect. A formal deed under the Great Seal was necessary for their completion. Till that was executed the grant was called inchoate. The Privy Seal was more properly applicable to gifts of personal estate and appointments to inferior offices under the Crown.

CHAPTER V.

Great difficulty was found in dealing with church livings. The bishops and priests of the Romish faith had still the legal right to the revenues; but they feared to draw down danger by claiming them boldly. Many of the Protestant nobles had got hold of valuable rights which had belonged to the church. The Lord James himself, before the Queen gave him his earldom, held his chief living as Prior of St. Andrews. The estates of the crown had been so encroached on by improvident grants during Mary's minority that the Queen's revenues were inadequate to the state expenses, and taxation was not yet recognised in Scotland as a legitimate means of supporting the crown. The Protestant ministers also were in need of some provision. A compromise[1] was eventually made by which every Catholic benefice should contribute a third of its yearly value, to be paid to the crown "for setting forward the common affairs of the country, and for the sustentation of the Protestant ministers." The former possessors were to retain two-thirds to themselves. Lethington, the Secretary of State, differed with Knox upon this matter, and each expressed his opinion in his own pithy way. Lethington declared

[1] 22d December 1561.

that after the ministers were provided for the Queen could not get at the year's end "what would buy her a pair of new shoon." Knox[1] described the settlement as

> "Twa parts to the devil,
> Ae part between God and the devil."

It was indeed an unfortunate arrangement, for it brought the Protestant clergy into continual conflict with the personal expenses of the Queen.

Murray early took a most insidious measure to perpetuate his authority. In the Parliament of 1563 he had an act passed called the Act of Oblivion. Its avowed and proper object was to insure an amnesty to all who had been engaged on either side in the disturbances which had been terminated by the Treaty of Leith. This act provided that everything that had been done contrary to law during that stormy period "should be buried and extinct for ever"—but it contained a sweeping exception, that no man should have the benefit of the act unless he was "worthy" of it; and to determine who were worthy a commission was appointed, a large majority of whom were of Murray's own party. It required the certificate of six of these commissioners to entitle any man to the protection of the act, and of these six, three at least must consist of Murray himself and certain lords named in the act, every one of whom had been engaged in the insurrection. It was further provided that the act should be unchangeable even by Parliament without the consent of every person who had "or might pretend to have

[1] Knox, ii. 310.

interest" in it! Such a law placed at the mercy of the dominant party every man who had opposed them during the struggle; for example, the act of Bothwell in intercepting the treasure which Elizabeth clandestinely sent to aid the insurgents might, in the absence of the clearest evidence of its source and destination, have been charged against Bothwell as a highway robbery, and he might have been sent to the gallows for it.

But while Murray was strong enough to pass this extraordinary measure, which, under a specious though thin disguise, was so dangerous to all who opposed him, Knox in vain urged him, now that he had the power, to "establish the religion;" in other words, to pass in a constitutional manner the informal Act of 1560, by which the *Confession of Faith* was sanctioned as the doctrine of the Church of Scotland. But Knox[1] says, "The Erledom of Murray needed confirmation, and many things were to be ratified that concerned the help of friends and servants," and "the matter fell so hote betwix the Erle of Murray and John Knox, that familiarlie after that tyme thei spack nott together more then a year and a half; for the said Johne, by his letter, gave a discharge to the said Erle of all farther intromissioun or cayr with his effaires. He maid unto him a discourse of thair first acquaintance; in what estait he was when that first thei spack together in London; how God had promoted him, and that abuif man's judgement; and in the end maid this conclusioun; but seeing that I perceave

[1] Knox, ii. 382.

myself frustrat of my expectatioun, which was that ye should ever have preferred God to your awin affectioun, and the advancement of his truth to your singular commoditie, I commit you to your awin wytt, and to the conducting of those who better can please you."

Mr. John Anthony Froude says—"Murray's noble nature had no taint of self in it."[1] Mr. Froude is a very eminent writer of history in the present day; but John Knox is perhaps a better authority on this point. From that time Murray seems to have listened to darker counsels; and this agrees with the character which Sir James Melville has left of him. "Murray himself," he says, "was at first of a gentil nature, weill inclined, gud with gud company, wyse with wyse company, stout with stout company, and contrarywyse with others of the contrary qualities; sa that as company chanced to fall about him, his busyness gaid rycht or wrang; and in his first uprising his hap was to leicht on the best sort."[2]

In truth he now fell chiefly into the hands of Lethington, whose deep and designing policy was celebrated afterwards in these pungent lines—

> This world it wags, I wat not how,
> And na man may anither trow,
> And every man dois pluke and pow,
> And that the pure may finde—
> Our court it is decayit now,
> The cruikit leads the blinde.

The Scottish Reformer had many collisions with the Queen also, and one of them occurred shortly before this

[1] Froude, viii. 223. [2] Melville's *Memoirs*, Bannatyne ed. p. 222.

time. He insisted on the penal law of 1560 being enforced against the Papists. She pleaded with him earnestly for two hours, in Knox's own words, "no to pitt haunds to punish ony man for using himsel in his religion as he pleases."[1] But Knox was obdurate, and Mary found herself obliged to yield. Accordingly, in the following month the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Prior of Whithorn, and forty-six others, were arraigned before the High Court of Justiciary for celebrating the mass, and punished by imprisonment. Knox says this was done of craft. But he records that many said: "See what the Queen has done; we'll bear with the Queen;" and that when she went to open Parliament there were cries of "God save that sweet face."

So great had Murray's ascendancy become that he at last proposed to the Queen that she should lease the crown to him and Argyle, and he also sought to have himself legitimated.[2] Mary was startled by these proposals, and began to think of strengthening her position by marriage.

[1] Knox, ii. 371. See also her answer to the General Assembly of the Church, Appendix No. III.

[2] From a fragmentary memorandum in Mary's own hand (1565) in the State Paper Office (see Appendix No. X.) The Instructions by Huntly, Argyle, Crawford, Eglinton, and thirteen other noblemen and prelates, for Mary's vindication state that "he proponit to the Quene's Majestie to have the Crown tailzeet, and himself to have the first place;" "the desyrer of the said tailzie wald never consent ony way that her Majestie sould marry ony sic Prince as maid suit at hir Hieness thairfoir cullouring the samin upon the alleging of mony inconvenientis that might follow" (Goodall, vol. ii. p. 358).

CHAPTER VI.

MARY STUART was indeed a winning, gentle-hearted woman, and the correspondence of her own time, before men's hearts were hardened against her by passion, bears much testimony to her virtues.

Throkmorton, the English ambassador in France, even during her war with England, wrote of "her great wisdom for her years, her modesty, her judgment in the wise handling of herself and her matters."[1] And another of the English ambassadors, who became one of her deadliest enemies, says of her only a few months before her grievous calamities were brought upon her: "There is one cheer and one countenance always in the Queen."[2] Even after she was imprisoned in Lochleven Throkmorton wrote of her to Elizabeth: "The Lords speak of the Queen with respect and reverence."[3] Lord Scrope said: "She has an eloquent tongue and a discreet head, stout courage and a liberal heart."[4] And Sir Francis Knollys reported of her: "She desireth much to hear of hardiness and valiancy,

[1] Throkmorton, 1560 (Tytler, vol. vi. p. 233).

[2] 25th December 1564, Randolph to Cecil.

[3] Throkmorton to Elizabeth, 14th July 1567; 18th July 1567 (Bibl. Burch. 4126; British Museum, Cotton Coll., "Plut." c. xii. b. 20).

[4] Scrope to Elizabeth, 29th May 1568 (Anderson, iv. 54).

commending by name all approved hardy men of her country although her enemies, and she concealeth no cowardness even in her friends."[1] Lethington wrote of her soon after her return to Scotland: "She doth declare a wisdom far exceeding her age."[2]

After she was uncrowned Murray and his council recorded of her, that "God had endowed her with many good and excellent gifts and virtues;"[3] and he spoke of her in the same way in private. He made his will soon after Darnley's death, and left the charge of his only daughter to the Queen.[4]

Sir James Melville, who was intimately acquainted with foreign courts, and was in close attendance on Mary's person till she was dethroned, and who was driven from her side by Bothwell's threats and violence, and so led to take part against her, yet wrote of her in his memoirs, long afterwards, that "she was sa effable, sa gracious, and discreet, that she wan great estimation and the harts of mony, baith in England and Scotland, and myn amang the rest; sa that I thocht her mair worthy to be served for little profit than ony ither prince in Europe for great commoditie."[5]

The Earl of Shrewsbury, after having had the custody of the Queen of Scots during fifteen years of her im-

[1] Knollys to Cecil, 11th June 1568 (Anderson, iv. 71).

[2] Lethington to Cecil, 20th October 1561 (State Paper Office).

[3] Act of Council (Goodall, ii. 63). Murray to Scrope, 7th Aug. 1568 (Anderson's *Collections*, iv. 116).

[4] See Appendix No. XV.

[5] Melville, Bannatyne ed., p. 111.

prisonment in England, was consulted by Elizabeth on the subject of a treaty for her liberation. She desired especially to know from him for her guidance whether Mary's promises could be relied on if she were free. Shrewsbury's answer was, "I believe that if the Queen of Scots promises anything, she will not break her word."

The eloquent appeal by which Mary sought to stay the shedding of blood between Catholic and Protestant in France,[1] has a beauty and power of expression, and a truth of feeling, which is not often found in the writings of princes. Her frequent and earnest pleadings with foreign powers for justice and mercy to her subjects cannot be read without interest and admiration. Her letters have been gathered from every corner of the earth, and every page of them marks the elegance and simplicity of her thoughts.

If any man who has a prejudice against her will sit down and read that correspondence, in which she treats of all the incidents of life, he will rise from the perusal with a different notion, not of her mind only, but her heart. These are records which we can read now, exactly as they dropped from her pen, untainted by the bitterness of party, as so little else which concerns her was permitted to be. And we can see her there as she disclosed herself to her most confidential friends, whether in the highest business of state or in the trivial affairs of daily life.—Her library, too, was in some degree an image of her mind; and the writings of the great Reformers were not excluded from it.

[1] Appendix No. IV. [2] As specimens see Appendix No. V.

CHAPTER VII.

MARY's beauty, her accomplishments, her high qualities, her kingdom, and her prospect of succession to the English throne, brought nearly all the unmarried princes of Europe as suitors to her feet. Elizabeth was seriously alarmed for the consequences, for Mary might so have bestowed her hand as to have engaged the chief powers of the Continent to join her in contesting the English throne. The strength of the Catholic party in England was very great. It is recorded that of the whole of those who were fit to hold the commission of the peace in England, not more than a third could be relied on to resist a Catholic competitor. Elizabeth's diplomacy was therefore earnestly directed to the exclusion of any continental candidate for Mary's hand; and Mary made it clear enough that she was willing to be guided in this, and in everything else, by her cousin, upon one condition, that her right of succession to the crown of England should be publicly recognised, so as to secure it to her and her posterity in the event of Elizabeth dying childless. That concession Elizabeth often in words seemed half-persuaded to grant, but she uniformly explained it away, and till the last day of her life refused to settle who should be her successor. Even on her death-bed, forty years after this time, she would

give no positive answer on the subject to her anxious counsellors; and it was only after she became speechless that she was persuaded to make a sign, by which they understood, and upon which they acted, that Mary's son was to be her successor on the throne. It has by some been thought an enigma in the life of a princess so provident as Elizabeth, that she should so long have resisted the entreaties of her subjects to protect them from the risks of a disputed succession. She kept her secret from fear of her life, apprehending, and perhaps not without cause in those terrible times, that if her life were once declared the only barrier to the succession of a Catholic prince, some fanatic hand might have found the means to hasten her death.

But she kept the succession dangling before Mary's eyes, and thus led her to reject one suitor after another till her patience was exhausted. Elizabeth then intimated in very obscure terms that she would be content if Mary would wed with "the best in England." Argyle, when he heard this, and thinking no one below the rank of sovereign a fit match for the Scottish Queen, sarcastically asked, "Is the Queen of England, then, become a man?"

Now commenced an episode perhaps the most singular in the history of this singular woman. It is notorious that Elizabeth was deeply attached to her favourite the Lord Robert Dudley, whom she afterwards made Earl of Leicester. He had secretly married Amy Robsart, and Elizabeth's wrath on the discovery of this step was well known. Amy Robsart's death

has always been regarded as a suspicious one. Mr. Froude, in his elaborate researches into the history of those times, has discovered letters of De Quadra, the Spanish ambassador in London, to his master the King of Spain, which throw grave doubts upon both Leicester and Elizabeth. If De Quadra's statements are true, he was told by Cecil, Elizabeth's Secretary of State, on the day before Dudley's wife died, that the Queen and Dudley were thinking of destroying her, and that they had given out that she was ill, but that it was not true.[1] The next day Elizabeth herself told De Quadra that she was dead, or nearly so; and before he despatched his letter her death, which was instantaneous, had become public. The common suspicions which attached to her death seem to have prevented the marriage which Elizabeth undoubtedly contemplated with Dudley.

Mary interpreted the enigmatical message of Elizabeth as pointing to her cousin Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley, son of the Earl of Lennox, who after herself was the nearest heir of the English crown. Elizabeth truly meant her own favourite the Earl of Leicester; but whether she was in earnest or not nobody has ever penetrated. She was very slow to name her man. A sense of the ridicule which might attach to the proposal seems to have restrained her. She was suspected of putting Leicester forward mainly for the purpose of giving him such a standing in the eyes of Europe that she might have some excuse for marrying him herself. It was a delicate negotiation for all concerned.

[1] Froude, vol. vii. p. 279.

Her most confidential ministers did not know what to make of it, and their consequent embarrassment can be easily traced in the correspondence. They obviously felt that if they were slack in recommending it they might be blamed for failure, and if too earnest or successful, they might incur the displeasure of their Queen by risking the loss of her favourite; and so their despatches are singularly balanced, blowing hot in one sentence and cold in the next. Cecil wrote to one of his confidants: "To say the truth of my knowledge in these tickle matters, I can affirm nothing that I can assure to continue."[1] Elizabeth hinted that she would settle the crown with Leicester if Mary took him. Leicester himself seems to have been puzzled. He suspected that she meant it as a trial of his constancy, and complained that it was a contrivance of his enemies to ruin him with both Queens. Mary saw the thing in its ridiculous aspect, and while she affected to treat the proposal with all due respect, enjoyed a quiet laugh at it in private.

While this affair was under discussion the banished Earl of Lennox obtained leave to revisit Scotland and to sue for the restoration of his confiscated estates. He brought letters from Elizabeth recommending him strongly to Mary's kindness; and his restoration was prompt and complete. He was speedily followed by his son, the Lord Darnley, a youth of nineteen, of gigantic stature, and one of the handsomest men of his time. He came by the advice of his mother, who was

[1] Cecil to Sir Thomas Smith, 30th December 1564 (Ellis' Letters, 2d series, vol. ii. p. 294).

Mary's aunt, to sue for her hand and kingdom, with £700 in his pocket! His attentions were kindly received by Mary, and the affections of both soon became deeply engaged. He early attached to himself a remarkable man who was then in Mary's service. His name was David Riccio. Darnley put himself under his guidance, and they became inseparable. Riccio had come to Scotland some years before as secretary to the embassy from Savoy. He had previously been employed in a similar capacity by the Archbishop of Turin. The suspicions of the people in after-times charged him with being a secret emissary of the Pope; and his previous employment, the ostensibly inferior place which he at first accepted in Mary's service, the astuteness of his counsels, and the near success of his schemes for a counter-revolution in the Roman Catholic interest, lend some probability to the suspicion. No accredited agent of the Pope durst then have shown his face in Scotland.

Riccio perceived at once the support which might be derived to his schemes for the restoration of the Romish Church, from an alliance between Mary and her cousin, who was of the same faith. Their marriage would unite an immense party in support of Mary's claims on the English throne. Riccio therefore readily lent himself to Darnley's wishes, and a love-match was speedily settled between the young cousins. For a time this was kept secret, for Mary wished to obtain the concurrence of her great lords before declaring her intentions. She accordingly convened them to ask their advice, and they unanimously approved of her

choice, the Earl of Murray joining with the rest, though not so cordially as Mary wished.

Elizabeth soon got a hint of what was going on, and protested energetically against it. Mary's loving brother, the Earl of Murray, who had been active in bringing back the house of Lennox, at once adopted the policy of England, and after a time of angry discussion, he laid down three principles for the Queen's guidance —1st, That she must not take her own choice; 2d, That she must not marry a Catholic; 3d, That she must be farther advised by her nobility. Mary resisted his propositions; and, to give himself standing with the people, he demanded that she should become a Protestant, or at least abandon the mass. On this point he knew that she was unchangeable.— Elizabeth feared the accession of strength which Mary would gain in England by uniting with hers the claims of the next candidate for the English crown. Accordingly she ordered her ambassador to require the return of Darnley and his father to England, under pain of confiscation. They disobeyed, Darnley saying to the ambassador with simplicity that he found himself very well where he was.

Elizabeth had Darnley's mother within her reach, and sent her to the Tower.

Retained as Murray was by Elizabeth's pay, such decisive demonstrations of her pleasure would no doubt have been enough to regulate his action. But he had reasons of his own. Darnley had been shown, on the map of Scotland, the vast possessions which Murray

had obtained from his sister's bounty, and the incautious youth had remarked that it was "too much for a subject." Mary was now in her twenty-third year, but when she made these grants she was a minor; and by the law of Scotland alienations of land made during minority, without a full price, are liable to be revoked for four years after majority. This was indisputable law for both prince and subject; and there was a farther law (then a century old[1]) that grants of land annexed to the crown could not be effectually made by the sovereign at any age without the approval of Parliament. Darnley's words were speedily carried to Murray; and his attention being thus called to the subject, he was not likely to overlook the consequences.

This was an uncomfortable prospect. How far it swayed the unselfish Earl in recalling his consent to Darnley's marriage, how far he was guided by his purchased duty to Elizabeth, how much by earnest zeal for the Protestant cause, it would be difficult to determine.

Murray was not alone in this great question of the crown lands. Morton, Lethington, and many more had got similar grants, and were in the same predicament. They raised the cry of the Kirk in danger! The Queen was to be married to a Papist! Was he not the heir of that detested marriage which Lennox, his father, had purchased from Henry VIII., by offering him the Protectorate of Scotland? Was it not through that very marriage that Darnley had pretensions to the English crown?

[1] Act 1455, c. 41.

CHAPTER VIII.

DARNLEY'S conduct became very extraordinary. His pride and violence were intolerable. He demanded that the Queen should give him the matrimonial crown, which she had not the power to give without the concurrence of Parliament. He insisted that he should at least be proclaimed king. And now we see this youth, whose £700 was all spent, and who was actually living on what he could borrow, refusing to complete the marriage which was the highest object of his ambition unless the Queen would comply with his demand. This was inexplicable at the time; but the truth is, that Riccio, fearing the efforts of the English party, had contrived to have them privately married in his own apartment, which he had fitted up as a chapel for the purpose.[1] It does not give us a very high opinion of Darnley to find him thus taking advantage of his position to extort from Mary, against her better judgment, a kingly rank which she had not the power to give without violating the constitution, and so strengthening the opposition which was already gathering against him. But Darnley was impenetrable to reason; and when the

[1] An unpublished letter by Randolph to Queen Elizabeth on this subject will be found in the Appendix No. VI.

Lord Justice-Clerk communicated to him that the Queen and Council thought it would be prudent to defer his inauguration as king, he actually attempted to stab him. In the end the Queen was driven to yield, but she did it most reluctantly, knowing how unsafe it was at such a critical moment to exceed her legitimate powers. The proclamation accordingly went forth on the night before the public marriage, and was repeated immediately after it was solemnised, that Darnley was to have the title of king, and that his name was to be conjoined with hers in all public acts and documents.

Darnley was no doubt much astonished to hear himself abused for religion. The English ambassador writes of him at that time as if he doubted whether he had any at all. He was willing to please both churches if he could. So he was married after the Popish form, but did not stay for the mass, and by and by went to hear a Protestant sermon. He had a great throne erected in St. Giles', chose a day when Knox was to preach there, and went in state. But if he had any doubts before, Knox soon removed them. He took the opportunity to tell his people that for their sins God had sent women and boys to rule over them! His youthful majesty did not relish such a sample of Presbyterian doctrine; so he left the kirk in a rage, and summoned Knox before the Privy Council. Knox stuck to his text, adding some things that were not more palatable, and was prohibited from preaching till their Majesties should leave

Edinburgh. An old writer of the time describes the incident in few words: "The king was crabbit, and discharged John from preaching." The provost had gone before the Privy Council with Knox. The foolish lad, riding on the tiptop of his kingly commission, sent an order to the town council, in their Majesties' names, to depose the provost, and elect another who was named in the message. The provost resigned—the council did as they were bid. They had not courage for the front of the battle; but they counselled Knox to resist. Things came to a fix between Knox and the king. Both parties seemed resolute; Mary perhaps enjoyed the joke, for Darnley was headstrong, and had acted against her advice. She could scarcely regret that his advances to the rival church should be so rudely repelled. She had the good sense to solve the difficulty by going to the country, taking her court and her laddie husband with her, which brought the prohibition against Knox's preaching to an end without any victory to either.

His Majesty next came across the traces of a poacher. He issued his royal command to have the offender "seized and brought before his Hieness in person, wherever he might be;" and he fulminated an edict that no man in broad Scotland should dare to carry a fowling-piece! If he had been allowed to go on, he would soon have put an end to both crown and government.

Elizabeth's dissatisfaction with the marriage soon produced serious consequences. She determined to

stir up another insurrection in Scotland, and Murray became the head of it. His first scheme, which is proved by the reports of the English ambassador,[1] was to seize Darnley and his father, to deliver them up to Elizabeth, and to imprison Mary. The very place of her confinement was named.[2] It was to be Loch-leven. It is ominous of what was to happen in the future.[3] Mary got timely notice of this design, and escaped it by a hasty gallop, at an unexpected hour, past the place where it was intended to intercept her party.

There was a darker plot against Darnley at this time.[4] Two letters remain in the State Paper Office by Randolph, the English ambassador—one to Cecil, the other to the Earl of Leicester.

They give us the first hint of any design against Darnley's life. In one he says: "Lord Darnley must be removed or his enemies supported. Why shouldn't her Majesty (Elizabeth) do it by force?" In the other he writes: "When they have said all, and thought what they can, they find nothing but that God must send him a short end or themselves a miserable life. To remedy this mischief, he must be taken away, or such as he hates find such support that whatsoever he intended to another may light upon himself." And then he asks his master, the prime minister of England, "what support may be expected *if* AUGHT *should be attempted,*

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 4th July 1565, in Keith (Spott.), ii. 309.
[2] Tytler's *Enquiry*, i. 377. [3] Strickland, iv. 146.
[4] 3d June 1565.

seeing the most part are persuaded that for this end" (the "short end" that God was to send to Darnley) "he was sent into this country." Here we have the most positive evidence that the idea of Darnley's assassination was suggested by one of Elizabeth's chief ministers to another eighteen months before he was murdered, even before his marriage with Mary was published, and while she is described in the same correspondence as so deeply attached to him that they account her bewitched.

Three months later[1] Randolph wrote: "Divers are appointed to set upon the Queen's husband, and either kill him or die themselves. If her Majesty (Elizabeth) will now help them, they doubt not but one country will receive both queens."

The Queen of Scots was afterwards (as every one knows) kept by Murray a prisoner in Lochleven on the pretence that *she* murdered her husband—this very Darnley. And while Randolph was thus pointing to that short end for him—which came shortly indeed—it must have been either marvellous foresight of Murray, or complete accord between him and Randolph, that led him at the same time to be planning that imprisonment in Lochleven for which Darnley's death was subsequently made the excuse.

Murray saw the advantage which he might derive from Darnley being proclaimed king without consent of Parliament. He was in want of an excuse for re-

[1] 3d September 1565 (Calig. b. 10, f. 335; Goodall, i. 206).

bellion. He at once denounced this step as unconstitutional, formed a confederacy with the Duke of Chatelherault, Argyle, and a powerful body of the nobles, and took up arms. On the public completion of the marriage, therefore, the young queen and king were at once involved in civil war. Mary acted with the resolution of her house, summoned the Earl of Bothwell and Huntly's son and heir, who were in banishment, collected her forces, and gave the command to Bothwell, who was the only man of military reputation in her service. She was in greater danger than she knew of, for the secret papers[1] of the English court show that her chief ministers, Morton and Lethington, had an understanding with her enemies, and waited a favourable opportunity to betray her. Randolph wrote to Cecil: "Maitland is as far in this matter as any other. Of the same bond and league are the Earl of Morton and Lord Ruthven; they only espy their times, and make fair weather until it come to the pinch."[2] Randolph also wrote to Leicester hinting again at a scheme for seizing Mary and carrying her into England, though he was still living at Mary's court as a peaceful ambassador.[3] And there is in existence a letter by Elizabeth to the Earl of Bedford instructing

[1] 19th September 1565, Bedford to Cecil (Appendix to State Papers, Scotland).

[2] Randolph to Cecil, 12th October 1565 (vol. xi. 64 of State Paper Office, Scotland). Quoted in Chalmers, ii. 464, note *t*, and vol. i. p. 155, note.

[3] December 1, 1565 (State Paper Office, vol. xi. 93). Maitland to Cecil, 9th February 1566 (*Ibid.* xii. 10).

him secretly, and as if of himself, to furnish Murray with money and soldiers, taking care not to let *her* be detected.[1]

Bothwell's energy disappointed these schemes. The people had no sympathy with the attempt to hinder the Queen from being married, and the rebels were finally driven to Dumfries, and thence into England. At this time[2] Murray wrote from Carlisle to Cecil entreating that support be hastened with all possible expedition, and reminding him that Queen Elizabeth was the principal instigator of their proceedings. But his defeat made a sudden change in her policy. Randolph, her ambassador at Edinburgh, had acted so clumsily in conveying aid to the rebels that he was found out. Foreign powers complained that she perpetually fomented troubles in Scotland; and she was not prepared for war. She had the Earl of Murray brought before her in presence of the French and Spanish ambassadors, obtained from him a collusive

[1] 12th September 1565, Elizabeth to Bedford (State Papers, Scotland, Appendix); 19th September 1565, Bedford to Cecil (Do.); 19th September 1565, Bedford to Elizabeth (Do.); 28th September 1565, Bedford to Elizabeth (Do.); same day to Cecil (Do. do.); 5th October 1565, Bedford (Appendix, Do.); also 6th.

[2] 14th October 1565 (State Paper Office). There is in the State Paper Office (vol. xii. Scotland, No. 18 B, p. 453) a receipt by the Earl of Murray to the Earl of Bedford, for the Queen of England, of £7000, "to be emploit in the comon cause and action now in hands within this realme of Scotland, enterprisit by the nobilitie thereof for mainteynance of the true religion. Dumfries, 1st October 1565. (Signed) JAMES STEWART."

acknowledgment on his knees that she never moved him to resist his sovereign, and immediately turned upon him and ordered him to get out of her presence for an unworthy traitor. Murray's submission to this violent insult gained for him Elizabeth's support for the rest of his life. She herself wrote to Mary with her own hand: "I have communicated fully to Randolph all that passed at my interview with one of your subjects (Murray), which I hope will satisfy you, wishing that your ears had heard the honour and affection which I manifested towards you to the complete disproof of what is said that I supported your rebel subjects against you—which will ever be very far from my heart, being too great an ignominy for a princess to tolerate, much more to do!"[1]

[1] Elizabeth to Mary Stuart, 29th October 1565 (Labanoff, 7, p. 59). The original (French) is in Appendix No. VII.

CHAPTER IX.

ELIZABETH'S disavowal was very mortifying to Randolph. He had committed himself deeply to Murray and his friends, and they were ruined. They had been the chief sources of his influence in Scotland. He was also under a cloud for having managed affairs so ill. Elizabeth was not apt to forget what had brought such public exposure on herself. Randolph's credit at home was shaken; his influence in Scotland gone. He was in risk of utter disgrace. Hitherto he had to deal with ministers who were his secret allies, and in the pay of his mistress. Now he was thwarted by the counsels of Riccio, who loved neither him, his creed, nor his court, who cared for none of them, and whose Italian blood and training probably gave him some advantage in diplomacy, and certainly recommended him to the Catholic party in both countries. Riccio still worked behind the scenes, but his hand was felt everywhere. He had done incalculable injury to the English interest and to Randolph; and there were rumours that he was to be placed in higher office. Randolph began to weave the threads of the conspiracy anew. Circumstances soon arose which enabled him to recruit its numbers in the most unlikely quarter, and to direct its action so as to put an end to all farther risk from the author of

his disgrace, without changing the real object of the conspiracy—the restoration of the English party to permanent power.

Mary was much elated by the humiliation of her rebels and the exposure of her rival's insincerity. Her feelings towards her young husband are graphically described in a contemporaneous letter:—"All honour that may be attributed unto any man by a wife he hath it wholly and fully; all praises that may be spoken of him he lacketh not from herself; no man pleaseth her that contenteth not him; and what may I say more?—she hath given over to him her whole will to be ruled and guided as himself best liketh; she can as much prevail with him in anything that is against his will as your lordship may with me to persuade that I should hang myself." And Darnley's father wrote to his wife on 19th December that the king, their son, continued "in good health and liking, and the Queen great with child."[1]

The success of Riccio's policy strengthened his influence with the Queen and the Catholic party, and encouraged him to proceed with his measures in favour of the Romish faith. But these measures were traversed by the folly of Darnley, who, incapable of comprehending the difficulties of Mary's position, thought this a fitting time to revive his demand for a full matrimonial crown. While he was in this mind (in the end of January 1565-66) the French king sent him the order of St. Michael. It was necessary on his investiture that he should exhibit a banner bearing his coat

[1] Lennox to his wife, 19th December 1565 (Haynes, 443).

of arms. The heralds considered that, as the crown had not been voted to him by Parliament, he was not entitled to display the royal arms. This led him to press his demand still more urgently. It was vain for Mary to plead with him that the time had not arrived when she could expect the consent of her Parliament to his wishes. In vain Riccio tried to persuade him that they had enough on their hands already. The English ambassador, on 24th January 1565-66, writes that Darnley demanded the crown-matrimonial with such impatience that the Queen repents she has done so much for him. He was pushed on by his father, and his discontent became the occasion of great evils.

On the last day of that month Mary addressed a letter to the Pope. It is a modern discovery. She states in it that the enemies of their religion had hitherto hindered her efforts, but that some of them were now banished, others at her mercy. She anticipates that their rage and extremity will drive them to desperate measures, and she entreats aid, temporal as well as spiritual, from his Holiness. Close on the despatch of this letter Clernault arrived from the Continent, bearing, for Mary's concurrence, an engagement by all the Catholic princes of Europe for putting down heresy. This compact was carried into execution some years later, after Mary had ceased to reign; and though she cannot be held responsible for the interpretation that was given to it, the atrocious massacre of St. Bartholomew, with the general prescription of the Protestants on the Continent, afford a frightful commentary upon it. It was suspected at the time, and

there is too much reason to believe, that Mary set her hand to this dangerous document.[1] She also made fruitless efforts at this time to induce Bothwell and others to go with her to mass. An interesting letter on this subject will be found in the Appendix.[2]

Riccio was resolute in his schemes, but not improvident. He saw the wisdom of bringing back to the support of the crown the powerful house of Hamilton, and he advised that a free pardon should be accorded to the Duke and the whole of his adherents, on condition that they should not return to Scotland without the Queen's permission. But this measure was most distasteful to Darnley's father, the Earl of Lennox. He could not forget the time, twenty years before, when he was the fugitive, Hamilton the regent. He had borne many long years of poverty in exile; why should not the hated Hamiltons suffer the same penalty of their treason? He would confiscate their estates and rise on their ruins. But Mary was of a gentler spirit. She was never unwilling to forgive those who had offended. She knew that the crown needed the friendship of its next heirs, the great ducal house. The Duke sued humbly; and that the wheels of mercy might move more smoothly he richly anointed Riccio's palms.[3] The pardon was granted, but Darnley could not appreciate

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 7th February 1565-66 (Robertson's *History of Scotland*, Appendix, p. 252). The statement in this letter, and in our text, derived from it, has been shown by Professor Wiesener to be an error. See Preface to this volume.

[2] Drury to Cecil, 16th February 1565-66 (Appendix hereto, No. VIII.)

[3] Lab. vii. 70.

its policy, and his father was blinded by hatred and cupidity.

The excitement of these events seems to have been too great for Darnley. In February 1565-66[1] the English governor of Berwick writes of him: "All people say that Darnley is too much addicted to drinking. At a merchant's house the Queen tried to dissuade him from drinking too much; he proceeded, and gave her such words that she left the place with tears—not strange to be seen. . . . These jars arise, amongst other things, from his seeking the matrimonial crown, which she will not yield unto, the calling in of the coin wherein they were both;[2] and the Duke's finding so favourable address hath much displeased both him and his father. His government is very much blamed, for he is thought to be wilful and haughty, and some say vicious, whereof too many were witnesses the other day at Inchkeith." He had indeed become so insolent that even his father, according to Strype's *Annals*, grew weary of his government and left the court.[3]

In the meantime Murray and his associates were assembled at Newcastle. He was in despair, reduced to sell his plate; and his letters express the extre-

[1] Keith, ii. 403, Spottiswoode edition. 16th Feb. 1565-66.

[2] This seems to have been a mistake of the writer. Shortly before this a new coin was issued, now commonly called the Crookston dollar, bearing the names of Mary and Henry.

[3] Sir William Cecil writes to Sir Thomas Smith, the English ambassador in France, on 1st September 1565: "The young king s so insolent as his father is weary of his government, and is departed from the court" (MS. Lansd. 102, art. 64).

mity to which he was brought. He sent a valuable diamond to Riccio,[1] hoping to win his favour, without success; for Riccio, it would seem, could be bribed only to what his judgment sanctioned.

The pardon of the Hamiltons was distasteful to the rest of the rebels. It detached from them the most powerful of their party, who were also the old enemies of Lennox. Randolph knew how to make good use of this, and so Darnley was drawn into common action with those who had so lately taken arms to oppose his marriage. Their united wrath was now concentrated on the head of the devoted David, and a door was thus opened for new political combinations, in which the interests of the House of Hamilton were to be disregarded. Archibald Douglas, a relation of Morton's and of Darnley's, was very active in this negotiation.

The banished lords kept up their correspondence with Mary's chancellor and secretary of state, Morton and Lethington. These trusted servants of the Queen, thoroughly informed of Darnley's urgent demands for power, of Lennox's resentment against Riccio for the restoration of Hamilton, and in intimate relations with Randolph, now found their opportunity, and began to do their part in the conspiracy against their unsuspecting mistress. Lethington at this time[2] wrote to Cecil: "That there was nothing so far past but that all might be reduced to their former state, but that there was no certain way unless they chopped at the *root*."

[1] Melville's *Memoirs*, p. 157.

[2] 9th February 1565-66 (State Paper Office, xii. 10).

That seems to point to the dethronement, if not the death, of the Queen.

Morton's ambiguous conduct attracted suspicion. He expected his dismissal from the office of chancellor, and it was understood that Riccio was to succeed him. We are also told that he was seriously alarmed by a rumour which had got abroad, and was probably not ill-founded, that the Queen contemplated the revocation in the approaching Parliament of the Crown grants made during her minority.[1]

A great blow had become necessary to restore the English influence in Scotland, to bring back the banished lords, save their estates, and check Riccio's schemes. Randolph was spurred to action by a further exposure of his clandestine dealings with the rebels. Riccio had the dexterity to get hold of a man who had actually carried a supply of gold from Randolph to Murray, and Randolph seems to have taken the alarm instantly.

Parties in such a state of mind were not difficult to bring to an understanding. What ensued is best told in a letter which Randolph sent to the Earl of Leicester for Elizabeth's private eye, with injunctions not to communicate it even to Cecil, her secretary of state. It is the earliest intimation we possess of what was coming, and is dated only a few days before the exposure of Randolph's practices became so flagrant that he was publicly dismissed by Mary from her court.

The modern disclosures of the State Paper Office

[1] 6th March 1566, Randolph to Cecil (State Paper Office, xii. 29).

are absolutely appalling. Randolph's letter[1] says: "I know that there are practices in hand, contrived by the father and son, to come by the crown against her will. I know that if that take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the king, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things grievouser and worse than these are brought to my ears, yea things intended against her own person, which because I think better to keep secret than write to my lord secretary, I speak not of them but now to your lordship."

The conditions expressly settled among the conspirators were, that the king was to have the crown-matrimonial, with a right of succession, and was to support "the religion," and David and others were to be "taken away," the very phrase which Randolph had used as to Darnley.[2]

Parliament had been summoned, and while this conspiracy was being matured, Murray wrote to Cecil from Newcastle praying Elizabeth's support:[3] "The Parliament of Scotland," he said, "draweth nigh, and is fixed for the 12th of March. 'Tis chiefly set and purposely to be holden for leading the process of forfeiture upon me and the noblemen here with me. Wherefore, unless this conference shall with due time prevent the same, it will be found very difficult to revoke such matters, having once taken effect." The earldom was in great danger.

[1] Berwick, 13th February 1565-66 (Wright, vol. i. p. 594; Tytler, vol. vii. 23 and 438).

[2] See p. 38. [3] 15th January 1565-6.

Riccio was warned of his peril. He was uneasy, but affected to laugh at it. He said the lords were like a flock of ducks, if you strike at one they will all get out of the way. "Na!" said his informant, "ye'll find their ways liker geese; if you meddle wi' ane they'll a' flee at ye and pluck ye till there's no a hair left."

Darnley was now in the hands of men who would have no scruple to use him for their purpose, and afterwards make him a scapegoat. In the moment of reconciliation they prepared a weapon for his destruction. They must interchange written engagements. And they gave him an engagement[1] that they should aid him in obtaining the matrimonial crown, and sustain him in possession if the Queen should die childless. But they took from the unwary youth a writing in which there was little ambiguity. It set forth that certain private persons, enemies to her Majesty, to him, and the nobility, and especially a stranger called David, were to be punished; "and in case of any difficulty, to cut them off immediately and slay them wherever it happens;"[2] that "it might chance that there be sundry great persons present who might gainstand the enterprise, wherewith some of them might be slain;" and because "it might chance to be done in the presence of the Queen's majesty, or within the palace of Holyrood House," he, on the word of a prince, would take the same on him, and warrant and

[1] Goodall, i. 228.

[2] Sloane Colln., 3199; also Tytler, vii. 28. Br. Museum, Calig. ix. p. 212. In Goodall, vol. i. 266.

keep harmless the earls, barons, and all others who should assist. This document is dated the 1st of March, more than a fortnight after the announcement to Leicester for Elizabeth. Darnley also bound himself by a writing which could bear inspection,[1] to procure the pardon and restoration of the rebels, and to maintain them in the possession of their estates. The counter-bonds by Murray and his confederates were dated the next day.[2]

On the 6th of March the Earl of Bedford, in a letter from Berwick, countersigned by Randolph,[3] wrote to Secretary Cecil (the plan being so far advanced that it was now necessary to take him into the secret) : "I have heard of late of a great attempt to be made by such advice as the Lord Darnley hath gotten of some noblemen in Scotland, whereby he thinketh to advance himself unto that which, by other means, he cannot attayne unto, whereby his credit may be the more in his countrie, and he hable to do more than to bear the bare name of a kinge, not having the due honor perteyning to suche a dignitie, by which means also the noblemen that are now oute of their countrie may, without great difficulty, be restored, and in the ende tranquilitie insue to that countrie, and percase to both the reaumes (realms). And now at this present, I being fully informed by Mr. Randolphe of his and their whole intent, the same being now at the poynte to be put in execution, I thought good to use Mr. Randolph's

[1] Goodall, i. 231. [2] Maitland Club Misc., vol. iii. p. 188.
[3] State Paper Office, vol. xii. p. 28.

handes in the writing of this lettre, because I wolde not that any of my own should be privie to any part of that which we finde very needful to be kept verrie secrete, having both of us promised upon our hands that no other salbe privie hereunto but the Q. ma^tie., my L. of Leicester, and you Mr. Secretharrie."[1] They then proceeded to detail the plot in their letter, stating that there were privy to it in England, "Murray, Rothes, Grange, myself (Bedford), and the writer hereof (Randolph); and in Scotland, Argyle, Morton, Boyd, Ruthven, and Leddington." They added: "If persuasions to cause the Q. to yoke to these matters do no good, they purpose to proceed we know not in what sorte. Yf she be hable to make any power at home, she shall be withborne and herself keapt from all other comfort than her own nobilitie. Yf she seek any forayne support, the Q. ma^tie., our Soverigne, shall be sought and sued unto to accept his and their defence, with offers reasonable to her majestie's contentment." And they enclosed copies of the deeds interchanged by the conspirators, taken, as they explained, by Randolph himself from the originals. These enclosures are kept with the letter in the State Paper Office. The engagement by the Earl of Murray and others to Darnley seems to be a *draft* in Randolph's handwriting, with alterations in a different hand, and there is a note at

[1] The rest of this letter has been published by Mr. Tytler. It makes manifest the political character of the plot, but attempts to cover it by a suggestion of improper familiarity between Riccio and the Queen.

the end, "Whatsoever youfind writting in Roman hande is added to these articles by the lordes." Darnley's engagement to the lords seems to be the original, and bears his signature, "Henry R." It is not dated inside, but is docqueted "Po. Martii, 1565."

Randolph and Bedford on the same day wrote direct to Queen Elizabeth herself that a matter of no small consequence was intended, by means whereof it was hoped that my Lord of Murray might be brought home, and referred her for particulars to the letter to Cecil.

The Parliament of Scotland assembled next day. The conscious Darnley refused to accompany Mary to open it. She could not understand his conduct. He went off to Leith to amuse himself. Mary wrote afterwards that "the spiritual estate was placed in the ancient manner, tending to have done some good anent restoring the auld religion." The Catholic prelates resumed their seats in Parliament, which they had for some years vacated. There was a real danger to the Protestant cause.

The Lords of the articles having been chosen, whose province it was to arrange the business, the Parliament adjourned according to practice till the following week. The day after Parliament met (8th March) Bedford and Randolph wrote from Berwick to the Earl of Leicester and Cecil, that the enterprise was growing to the desired point, and that Argyle and Morton were accorded. They said: "To-morrow my L. of Murray and his will be in this toune; upon Sunday at night, at Edinburgh; but that which is in-

tended shalbe executed before his coming there upon him whom you know."[1] On the same day (8th March) Murray wrote from Newcastle to Cecil, that "he and the rest of his company were summoned home for the weal of religion."

Accordingly on the next day, Saturday the 9th of March 1566, about eight o'clock in the evening (just at the close of an eight days' fast which had been ordered by the Kirk in Edinburgh), the palace of Holyrood was quietly surrounded by a strong body of conspirators, under the direction of the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Morton. Mary was at supper with her half-sister the Countess of Argyle, in her little cabinet. Riccio was in attendance in the cabinet; also the commendator of Holyrood and one of the Beatons, Arthur Erskine, and Anthony Standen. All the passages were noiselessly secured and guarded by the conspirators, after which a message was sent to the King that all was ready. He, with Lord Ruthven and others, awaited the signal in his private room. He immediately passed up by his private stair to the Queen's apartments, followed by Ruthven who was in armour. Riccio was seized in the Queen's presence, dragged from the apartment, and barbarously murdered in the ante-room. He received fifty-six wounds; and the King's dagger, which one of the conspirators had snatched from him, was left sticking in the body. It appears by a State paper of that time, recently discovered in the archives of the house of Medici, that the original scheme of the conspirators

[1] State Paper Office, Scottish Series, vol. xii.

was to have executed their design when Riccio was at Seatoun, eight miles from Edinburgh, but that the vigilance of Lord Seatoun had prevented them. It had next been planned to seize and assassinate him when playing at tennis (as he was accustomed to do) with the King; but one of the conspirators had suggested, and all had agreed, that the plot should be executed in the very presence of the Queen (which indeed is provided for in Darnley's bond), in order that they might set abroad a story that the King caught him alone with the Queen in her bedroom, and had commanded him to be slain from jealousy. The infamous tale was widely propagated. Randolph was not improbably its author, for his letter to Leicester reporting the plot nearly a month before its execution, cloaks it with a suggestion of that kind, and there can be no doubt means were actually taken to work on the jealousy as well as the ambition of the feeble Darnley. But Darnley himself, a few days after the murder, declared to the conspirators that he would stake his life on Mary's honour.[1]

The Queen's deportment towards Bothwell up to this time must have been irreproachable, since the conspirators could contrive nothing more plausible against her than to suggest an intimacy with poor David, whom all the historians describe as misshapen and "ill-faured." One who was well acquainted with him describes him as in years, dark and very ill favoured, but of rare prudence, and very skilful in business.[2]

[1] Ruthven's Narrative in Keith's *Appendix*, p. 128.

[2] Louis Guryon ; Miss Strickland, iv. 264.

Their changes of plan, however, account for the delay in executing the conspiracy beyond the time for which it was first announced by Randolph to Leicester.

Mary was, at this time, in a very critical state—within three months she was to become a mother. This was well known at the English Court, for their ambassador had written some time before that he "feared" it was true. The phrase indicates the feeling of his court on the subject. The alarm and excitement of the terrible tragedy which had been executed in Mary's presence threw her for a time into great danger. During the struggle, one ruffian, Carr of Faudonside, had presented a cocked pistol to her breast; another stabbed Riccio over her shoulder while she tried to protect him; and a third threatened to "cut her in collops and cast her over the walls." Her own belief was, that the lives of herself and her unborn child were intentionally put in peril; and a paper recently discovered,[1] as well as the mysterious language of Randolph's letter to Leicester, leave no doubt that the Queen's death was not excluded from the scheme of the conspirators. If Mary had died childless Darnley was the next heir to the English crown. And when we remember his position in that respect, it is not probable that he would have been led into the conspiracy at all, or have separated himself from the interest of his wife, without at least knowing that Randolph was sure of the approval of his Court.

Next day after Riccio's murder (Sunday), Murray

[1] See the paper in Appendix to Tytler, vii. 439.

appeared on the scene, as previously arranged; and, on seeing the Queen, professed the utmost distress, and actually shed tears in sympathy with her,—but not the less was she kept a prisoner in the palace. Murray passed to the secret conclave of the conspirators, and took part in a discussion whether she should be executed or imprisoned for life. The conspirators settled at the meeting that she should be imprisoned till she should approve in Parliament all that had been done, and give the King the crown-matrimonial and the whole government; or else they firmly purposed to have put her to death or detained her in perpetual captivity.[1] The law which denounced death for three celebrations of the mass could have been made the excuse. The General Assembly of the Kirk had sent an address to the Queen a few months before, requiring that that law should be enforced, not only against the subjects, but "in the Queen's Majesty's awin person, with punishment to all offenders."[2]

Darnley, at the desire of the other conspirators, issued a royal proclamation in his own name, ordering all who had come to attend the Parliament to quit Edinburgh immediately. He, in fact, assumed the power of dissolving Parliament, an act of the highest treason. But he began soon to discover that he had not the weight with the conspirators which he expected, and that small attention was paid to his wishes, even

[1] Mary's letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 2d April 1566 (see Appendix No. IX.; also Keith, 332; Tytler, vii. 40).

[2] Appendix No. III.

in the placing of guards and other arrangements at the palace. Mary seized an opportunity to speak with him alone. She had had the presence of mind, at the earliest moment, to send for and secure the confidential papers of which Riccio had the charge; and if Riccio was really a secret agent of the Church of Rome, she probably now exhibited some of these papers to her husband that he might understand the truth. We can conceive the revulsion which such a disclosure would create in the mind of one who had been bred in the Catholic faith. Something very extraordinary must have passed at this conference between the King and Queen, for from that moment he joined the Queen in countermining the conspirators. It was essential to the safety of both that he should appear to continue his relations with them; and he so won their confidence that they at last withdrew the guards on his undertaking the charge of the Queen. This was accomplished on the second night after the murder; and on that night he and Mary made their escape secretly from the palace, and fled together to the castle of Dunbar. The Earls of Bothwell and Huntly, who alone of all the lords in the palace remained faithful to their duty, had escaped through a window on the night of the murder. They were no doubt two of the "sundry great persons" referred to in Darnley's bond as not unlikely to gainstand the enterprise and be slain. With extraordinary energy they levied a considerable power after their escape, to rescue the Queen. Mary and her husband thus found

themselves at once at the head of a force which the conspirators could not resist; and as she advanced on Edinburgh they broke up in confusion and fled for their lives. Most of them betook themselves to Berwick, where they reported the minutest particulars of the murder to Elizabeth's officers. By them the whole details were transmitted direct from the mouths of the murderers to Elizabeth and her ministers, who were expressly told that these details were given "by the parties' self that were there present and assisters;" and there was added, in a postscript, a full list of the conspirators, with this recommendation of their good service:—"My Lord of Murray, by a special servant sent unto us, desireth your honour's favor to these nobill men as his dear friends, and such as for his sake hath given this adventure."[1] Robertson, in his *History of Scotland*,[2] has quoted the greater part of this letter, and refers to the original, but he has missed this important passage, which discloses that Murray was the real head of the conspiracy, and the chief organ of communication between the conspirators in England and the English Government. This is the more singular, because the postscript is very prominently placed in the original, between the signatures of Bedford and Randolph; and the letter itself is marked at the top as "touching the death of David Rizzio, *and Murray's privity therein.*" Murray made reports

[1] Bedford and Randolph to Privy Council, 27th March 1566 (Ellis's *Original Letters*, First Series, vol. ii. p. 207-220).

[2] Robertson's Appendix, No. 15, p. 253.

direct to Elizabeth, Leicester, and Cecil, in regard to the whole business.

Queen Elizabeth could not have been accounted guiltless, even if she had remained passive, merely concealing from her royal sister the bloody tragedy which was being prepared for her with the knowledge of the English ambassador.[1] But she supported Randolph vehemently, protected the assassins, trafficked anew with the royal succession, till she got them restored,[2] supplied Murray with money (several thousand pounds), immediately before and immediately after Riccio's death, and took the first opportunity to gratify her vindictiveness against Darnley by open insult.[3]

Further light is thrown on the true cause of Riccio's murder by the fact, which is not well known, that on the same night on which he was slain, a Roman Catholic friar, John Black, one of the Queen's preachers, was assassinated in his bed. This friar had made himself prominent in disputation with Willock the Reformer. He had been waylaid and abused on the streets of Edinburgh, in the previous year, by a gang of four, who were tried for it;[4] and every one of that gang fled and was outlawed for the murder of Riccio.[5]

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 8th March 1566 (Cal. Scot. xii. 31).

[2] Elizabeth to Bedford, 2d April 1566 (State Papers, Scotland, Appendix).

[3] Cal. Scot. State Papers, Appendix, 16th March 1566.

[4] Pitcairn, vol. i. 475, and 484, 485.

[5] Knox's *History*, Woodrow edition, vol. ii. p. 593. Bedford to Cecil, 18th March 1565 (State Paper Office, vol. xii. p. 545) —"David, as I wrote to you in my last letter, is slayne, and at

The King now denied everything to Mary, except that he had licensed Murray and others to come home. He even committed himself so far as to put out a proclamation[1] repudiating all connection with the conspiracy. For his own sake, therefore, he concealed Murray's secret bond. Murray became aware of this. He had fled with the rest, but on finding that the Queen was still ignorant of his share in the conspiracy, he addressed himself to her for pardon, and her indignation was so roused against Morton and those who had been engaged in the atrocious deed, that she readily forgave all who, as she supposed, had merely taken arms against her during the previous summer. How Murray and his confederates at the English Court must have chuckled when they found that Mary, to be avenged on the authors of Riccio's murder, thus unwittingly gave pardon, and eventually office, to its chiefs![2]

She took the precaution, however, to except from the pardon any act of treason directed against her own person; and hence Murray, though received into confi-

the same tyme was left slayne by like order one Friar Black, a ranke Papist and a man of evil life, whose death was attempted by other befoir." Randolph on the same day says of Black, "he was admitted for one of the Q.'s chief preachers, and not long since gave in a supplication in his own name and brethren to have a place erected for them. He was above 2 months past met late in the night suspitiouslie, and being known he got 2 or 3 blows with a cudgell and one with a dagger that was like to have cost him his life."

[1] Goodall, i. 280.

[2] Randolph to Cecil, 21st March 1566 (Tytler, vol. vii. p. 429).

dence, never felt himself entirely safe till she was in Lochleven.

We get some idea of Riccio's power in the State when we consider the effect of his death. It was like a change in the kaleidoscope. But it was a change of persons, rather than of purposes. The conspiracy went on; the actors exchanged places. Murray and his immediate followers were now in the Queen's palace and councils; Morton, Lethington, and their comrades had gone into banishment. Their clandestine correspondence was kept up. Both parties were in secret communication with the English Court. Elizabeth ordered Morton to quit England, and winked at his remaining. The ultimate aim of the conspiracy, the seizure of the supreme power in Scotland, still remained to be accomplished. Darnley's betrayal had ruined their cause in the moment of success, and brought into jeopardy the lives and fortunes of the great body of the conspirators. It purchased for him their undying hatred; and when we remember the desperate character of the act with which their hands were still reeking, and the schemes for giving him a short end which had been thought of at the time of his marriage, we can hardly doubt that from that hour Darnley was devoted to destruction. If Mary herself could now be made the scapegoat, just as they had planned to make him the means of her destruction, and Bothwell (who had done them so much harm, and whom they had hitherto failed to corrupt) be used as the instrument of her ruin and their safety, their triumph might still be complete. Eighty of them

were fugitive with Morton, a majority of whom had each thrust his dagger into Riccio's body, and among them was Morton's cousin, Archibald Douglas, who becomes prominent hereafter. The men, the victims, and the plan of the grand catastrophe are already coming into view.

CHAPTER X.

Riccio had incurred the private hatred of not a few of his assassins. The manner of his death, and the multitude of his wounds, are plain indications of gratified revenge. But it would be unjust to suppose that the conspirators were wholly moved by personal considerations. Behind the immediate actors there were others who had loftier motives; and there were not wanting grand ideas to mislead the imagination, and, in their own eyes, even to hallow the crime.

The Reformation in Scotland had made immense progress in Mary's reign. After she came to the throne it was for the first time permitted to read the Scriptures in the common tongue. The seed thus sown fructified and grew. And though the Protestants were afterwards proscribed and persecuted under the Queen-Regent, her mother, the great body of the people gradually imbibed the doctrines of the Reformation.—The force of opinion had become more powerful than positive law. We have seen the Catholic prelates, with the law and the Sovereign on their side, excluding themselves till now from Parliament, and yielding a share of their revenues to the Protestant ministers. Power had passed to the other side, and unhappily there passed with it the spirit of persecution, too often the child of power when it feels itself insecure.

All the progress which had been made was brought into peril by Riccio, and it was thought impossible to stay him without violence. One section of the conspirators seems to have contemplated that he should be seized and brought to trial, not that he should be assassinated. Knox was probably one of these. In Randolph's reports[1] he is named as "consenting to the death of David." If he was truly privy to the scheme (which has been much controverted), he no doubt expected a less passionate execution.[2] That he looked to Riccio's death for relief to the Protestant cause is more than probable. The week of fasting[3] which preceded the catastrophe was regarded by some as giving to the event the solemnity of a providential visitation. During that week Knox took occasion to preach from the Old Testament examples of God's sudden judgments on the enemies of his people; and when the conspirators broke up and made their escape on the approach of the royal forces, he felt himself sufficiently compromised to secure his safety by flight,[4] nor did he venture to

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 21st March 1565-6 (State Paper Office).

[2] Morton and Ruthven, in their report to Cecil, 27th March 1566, say, as to Riccio's death, that "in the manner of execution, following the King's advice, they did more than was deliberated" (State Paper Office).

[3] "Saturday, 2d March 1565-6.—The ministers ordered a fast from Saturday 8 hours afternoon to Sunday 5 hours at evening, and then to take but bread and drink in a sober manner, and the same next Sunday, for the lords now banished."

"9th March.—Saturday at 8 hours eve, Riccio cruelly slain" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*).

[4] "17th March 1565-6.—The haill lords, committers of the

enter the capital again till Mary was dethroned. But whatever may have been his ideas, the suddenness of Riccio's death could not have been unexpected by the chief conspirators, for we have seen that it was deliberately provided for in Darnley's bond.

Lethington was a far-sighted statesman. He recognised the impolicy of perpetuating two separate governments in one small isle, to watch and weaken each other, when, by uniting, they might become almost invulnerable. He saw that the genius of the people, and the similarity of their language and faith, permitted them to amalgamate. The union of England and Scotland was the pole-star of his life. It was not accomplished in the Crown till half a century later. It took another century before the two countries had a common Parliament. Even at this day their amalgamation is not perfected by a common code of law, or a common system of administrative government;—so slow has been the growth of the conception which Lethington favoured. His scheme explains much that is apparently inconsistent in his history. He would have been content with Elizabeth to rule the two kingdoms. He could have been content also with Mary if he could have secured her succession to the English crown. At this juncture he would have been content with Darnley, looking to the same object. A few months later he

slaughter, and the Lords that were banished before, departed from Edinburgh toward Linlithgow with dolorous hearts. John Knox likeways departed at two hours afternoon."

"18th March.—King and Queen, with 2000 men, returned to Edinburgh" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*).

took the lead anew in a negotiation for Mary's succession. That having failed, he accepted James as the heir of both thrones. And again, thinking James insecure, he died a champion of Mary's rights.

Cecil, though not early trusted with the secret of the conspiracy, had come to share Lethington's views as to the union of the kingdoms; but he looked for a Protestant throne, and rejected Mary throughout.

Murray's ambition, chastened by misfortune, aimed now at the substance without seeking all the trappings of power. He had from the first zealously embraced the cause of the Reformation. He possessed a character for blunt honesty which does not altogether agree with some of the things which we now know of him. But he must have possessed some high qualities to have gained and kept the confidence of so many of those with whom he acted. And we may be permitted to judge the characters of public men in revolutionary times rather by the general tendency of their schemes than by isolated acts.

The nation advanced, half-unconsciously, resolute to retain its freedom, excusing the incidents of the struggle for sake of the cause, and perhaps not perceiving that the safety of the Crown was involved.—Mary sustained the battle, fully alive to its imminent perils.

Cecil at this time wielded the whole power of England. Murray had long been the mainspring of political action in Scotland. Their alliance was of old standing. It was Cecil who, six years before, wrote of the probability of Murray becoming king; but he now

spoke of it no more. It would have barred the scheme of union. When these two had last met, Murray was in banishment for an attempt by force of arms to subvert his sister's throne. Cecil had been her bitter and persistent enemy all her life. That had long been disguised; but an accident disclosed it. A spy, named Rokeby, professing to be sent by the Catholic party in England to concert an insurrection for the purpose of dethroning Elizabeth, came to Mary. She ordered him to be seized and searched: Cecil's instructions were found in his pocket![1] The character of this gentleman may be guessed from the circumstance, that next year his brother made a proposition to one of Elizabeth's ministers to murder Bothwell. Cecil's safety made it necessary, from the part he had taken towards Mary, that by some means she should be excluded from the succession to the crown of England. Murray's projects made it equally necessary that she should be governed by him, or driven from the throne of Scotland. The conspiracy for Riccio's death, and the palace revolution which restored Murray to power, had followed rapidly on the last interview between these two men; and we have seen that they were in intimate communication on the subject of it, and that Murray commended the perpetrators to Cecil's favour. They then knew of Mary's condition, her prospect of being soon a mother, and could not have overlooked the great probability that such a violent and bloody catastrophe, executed in her presence,

[1] State Papers, vols. xii. 81; xiv. 43.

might involve the lives of both mother and child. That event was not unprovided for.[1] Their scheme then was to make Darnley their puppet-king for his lifetime, ruling the state in his name. He was too weak to be dangerous to them, and his secret bond for the murder could have been used as a check on him, or, if necessary, might be made an excuse for his destruction. Their engagement to him bore that they were to maintain his right to succeed the Queen if she died childless. This was a blow to the Duke, her legitimate heir. But they had a more important object; for, on the death of Mary without children, Darnley, as we have seen, was the next heir to the crown of England; and, as with Lethington, however difficult it may seem to reconcile the apparent changes in the joint policy of Cecil and Murray, there seems to be one key to nearly the whole of it—it was planned to secure the direction of the person—Mary, or Darnley, or Mary's child—who was likely to be the next heir to the throne of England. Darnley's defection, after Riccio's murder, had disconcerted their schemes. We shall find them resumed hereafter, but they could never trust him again. They had found a barrier where they hoped to secure an instrument. Yet, if he lived, he was almost sure to become their master. Should Mary succeed to the English crown, he, as her husband, must have weight in the government. If a child of Mary's should succeed, Darnley would be his natural guardian. Should Mary die childless, he was himself the next heir.

[1] Maitland Club Miscellany, vol. iii. p. 188.

CHAPTER XI.

Two months after Riccio's murder, Murray sat with smooth face at his sister's Council board, and joined in a resolution that "justice should be sharply execute on all who were of the devise counsel or committing of the slauchter of Davie." What must have been his feelings when these words were written before his face, where they still remain, in the records of the Privy Council!

The execution of this resolve was in the hands of treacherous agents. There can be no doubt that Mary was earnest that justice should be done on those who were guilty of Riccio's murder. But a full month afterwards, the Council minutes record that "the King and Queen can as yet perceive little or no execution of their orders as to the criminals—nay, that some of them spare not to remain within the realm."[1] The confederates in truth had held the appointment to all public offices for many years; the Crown had scarce a servant who was not at their devotion. And while there was no want of will in the Queen, there was a complete paralysis of justice.

The Earl of Bothwell, during the six months which had elapsed since his recall from exile, had twice saved

[1] 8th June 1566.

the Crown. These important services amply account for his future weight in the country. Up to this time, at least, he had received small favour at the hands of Mary. His exploit in intercepting the treasure which the Queen of England transmitted secretly to aid the rebels in 1559, involved him in bitterness with Elizabeth as well as Murray and other leaders of that insurrection. Arran made it the occasion of a personal quarrel, and Bothwell challenged him to combat.[1] They were not permitted to fight, but bad blood continued between them for several years, and in consequence of it Mary forbade Bothwell to approach the Court.[2] In the end, Knox, at Bothwell's request, undertook the office of peace-maker, and they were reconciled.[3] Knox writes with singular tenderness and respect of Bothwell, and records with clannish pride that "his grandfather, gudsire, and father had served the Bothwells, and some of them had died under their standards." A few days after the reconciliation, Arran rushed into the presence of the Queen, and avowed that Bothwell had proposed to him a scheme for seizing her person and carrying her to Dumbarton.[4] This was three years before Riccio's murder. Arran was supposed to have a romantic passion for Mary. She ordered both him and Bothwell into custody.[5] Arran soon became insane, and

[1] The challenge and answer (very curious) will be found in the Appendix No. XI.

[2] 26th August 1561 (Appendix to State Papers).

[3] March 1562.

[4] 1562, 7th April (Randolph, State Papers, Scot. App.)

[5] April 1562.

it remains a mystery whether his charge against Bothwell was true, or whether it arose from the fancies of a disordered mind. Subsequent events make it probable that such a scheme had even thus early been in Bothwell's contemplation. Arran was confined for many years; but Bothwell, after being a prisoner from April till the end of August, effected his escape, and fortified himself in his castle of Hermitage. When he saw the fate of Huntly he surrendered his castle and took refuge in England. He now fell into Elizabeth's hands, and she revenged the seizure of her treasure by keeping him a prisoner. After a long detention, he was released, and went to the Continent. Soon after Darnley arrived in Scotland Bothwell ventured to return. Mary's displeasure at this step is mentioned in a letter of the English ambassador.[1] Bothwell, in the bitterness of exile, had made use of very disrespectful language in regard to both queens. He said of Elizabeth, in very coarse words, that she was no better than she should be.[2] And he said something equally or, if possible, more offensive in regard to Mary. His mildest phrase was that "both Queens would not make one honest woman." These were offences which no guilty woman was likely ever to forgive. Bothwell was

[1] "The Queen misliketh Bothwell's coming home, and hath summoned him to undergo the law or be proclaimed a rebel. He is charged to have spoken dishonourably of the Queen, and to have threatened to kill Murray and Ledington. David Pringle, one of Bothwell's servants, will verifie it" (Randolph to Cecil, 15th March 1565; Spottiswoode edition of Keith, ii. 266).

[2] Randolph, 31st March 1565 (State Papers, Scot. Appendix).

summoned in 1565 to answer for his treasonable designs against the Queen's person, and the full details of his proposal to seize her by violence are recorded in the official documents of that period.[1] The circumstance that he ultimately carried out a design of this description five years after his proposal to Arran, makes this part of his history (which is little known) peculiarly interesting in its bearing upon Mary's conduct in regard to him. Bothwell did not present himself at the trial, alleging fear of Murray. This was a short time before Mary's marriage to Darnley. He then fled anew. The anger of his sovereign pursued him, and interest was made through the English ambassador to prevent his reception in England.[2] He betook himself to France, and remained there till Murray's insurrection in September 1565 compelled Mary to call to her aid all whom she could reconcile, and she then gave him a pardon. A few days before Riccio's murder (February 1566), Bothwell was married in the Queen's palace, with much rejoicing,[3] to the young and accomplished sister of the Earl of Huntly, the Queen's cousin;[4] and the Queen gave her her wedding dress.

Darnley's folly in joining the conspirators, on the occasion of Riccio's murder, had wrung Mary's heart;

[1] See Summons of Treason against Bothwell (May 1565) in Appendix No. XII.

[2] See Letter from Randolph to Cecil, 15th March 1565, in Appendix No. XIII.

[3] "1565-6, Feby. 24.—Bothwell married to Jean Gordon in Abbey Kirk with great magnificence" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*).

[4] February 1565-6. See Appendix No. VIII.

but it was so prodigious that, after the first burst of grief, she saw clearly that he was the dupe and tool of others. Her respect for him could not be otherwise than shaken; but her affection preserved him from the punishment which he richly merited. And for his sake she spared his father also, whom she justly blamed most; but she never permitted *him* to enter her presence again. Considering that she had restored him for treason only twelve months before, and that he had now repeated the offence under such aggravated circumstances, and had beguiled his son into the same evil course, bringing misery upon her household, her forbearance can be attributed only to surviving tenderness for her husband. Nor was this from ignorance of the full extent of his guilt. One of the first means taken by the conspirators to revenge themselves on Darnley was to contrive that his secret bond for the murder of Riccio should be shown to the Queen. This placed his life in her hands. She was deeply hurt by the reference which it made to her own person; but nothing could induce her to permit Darnley or his father to be brought to justice. It would rather seem that she had the tenderness to spare him the knowledge that this document had been disclosed to her. It did not include the names of the other conspirators. It spoke of them in general terms as "the nobles and others." It could therefore be shown to the Queen without disclosing the names of Murray and those who had escaped suspicion. The writing to which their signatures were attached was of course in Darnley's hands; but he had denied

the whole matter to the Queen. When, therefore, he saw Murray restored and sitting at the Council board, he well knew how much the Queen's confidence was abused; he chafed under it; and he warned her of it. She could not believe it, and it would seem that he could not venture to produce the evidence of it, which in his duplicate probably bore his father's signature among the rest. She was too just to act without proof; and though we know that Bothwell joined in the King's views regarding both Murray and Lethington,[1] Murray kept his ground, and wrote to Cecil that his reconciliation with his sovereign was in good case.[2]

While these discussions were proceeding the Queen gave birth to a son,[3] who afterwards, as James I., united on his head the crowns of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Sir James Melville was instantly despatched to convey the intelligence to Queen Elizabeth. She was struck down by it, exclaiming—"The Queen of Scots has a fair son, and I am a barren stock!" But next day she received the messenger with affected rejoicing.

[1] See Morton's letter to Forster, July 1566 (vol. xii. No. 89, State Papers), in Appendix No. XIV.

[2] 11th July 1566 (vol. xii. No. 85, State Papers).

[3] 19th June 1566.

CHAPTER XII.

THE auspicious birth of their son and heir, Prince James, did much to restore a good understanding between Mary and her husband. Still, Darnley was uneasy at the presence of Murray, and talked so wildly to the Queen of his resolution to have that nobleman's life, that she found it necessary to speak to him with severity, and also to put Murray on his guard.[1] She brought them together: Darnley apologised, and she tried to make peace between them. But Darnley feared that Murray's influence would procure the pardon of the other conspirators; indeed Murray seized the occasion of the young Prince's birth to urge a general amnesty. Mary was not unwilling: she never was deaf to a cry for mercy: but Darnley resisted the proposal vehemently, and with success. He had influence enough to persuade the Queen to join him in entering a minute, hitherto unnoticed, on the records of the Privy Council, that no remission should be granted, "without any exception," for a year.[2] Such a surcease in the exercise of one of the highest prerogatives of the Crown was obviously the expedient of a

[1] August 1566, Bedford (Robertson, App. p. 255).

[2] Original minute by King and Queen in Record of Privy Council, 21st July 1566.

schoolboy, not of a statesman. It shows how sincerely the Queen must have been attached to him, that she permitted herself to join in such an act for his gratification. For it must be remembered that she was four years older than Darnley, and was a woman of the sharpest wit and large political experience.—The exigencies of State were soon found too powerful for such a feeble contrivance.

The birth of James, who united in his person the rights of both Mary and Darnley, made it possible for Murray and Cecil to renew their schemes. They had found by experience that Mary's creed unfitted her for their purpose. Darnley was excluded by his treachery. The Hamiltons were not of the English succession. To have put up Murray himself for the crown would have broken off from them all those of his own party who regarded the rights of legitimacy, and a very powerful section in both countries who longed to see the crowns united. But James was the lawful heir of both crowns, and for many years must be under tutelage. To win their game now needed only the removal of Darnley and Mary;—and within one twelvemonth from that child's birth we shall see Darnley swept from the scene, Mary uncrowned and a prisoner in Lochleven, that infant set up in her place, Murray proclaimed Regent, Elizabeth's crown secured, Cecil's power perpetuated. Such a remarkable sequence of events could scarce have been fortuitous.

Queen Elizabeth consented, at Mary's request, to be godmother at the young Prince's baptism, and to

send an ambassador of the highest rank to represent her on the occasion. Now that there was an heir, Elizabeth professed to be better affected to a settlement of the succession, and there was ostensibly every reason to hope that an end might at last be put to the unfortunate differences which had so long divided the Queens. But there was only one man in Scotland whose experience and skill fitted him to treat of such momentous affairs with the astute diplomatists of Elizabeth. That man was Maitland of Lethington, who still held the office of secretary, though in disgrace from his suspected concern in Riccio's death. Mary was deeply conscious of the vast importance to her child of a friendly settlement, by which his ultimate right to the throne of England might be secured; and she was finally compelled to receive Lethington back. The records show that he resumed his seat at the Privy Council on 17th September 1566. Darnley was much opposed to this measure, and Bothwell, again in full concert with the King, and resisted by Mary, took the same side so strongly that it was said he threatened to slay Lethington in the palace.[1] Darnley's discontent was greatly aggravated by a hint which he received, that Elizabeth's ambassador was not to recognise him as King. This marked her vindictiveness for his betrayal of the conspirators. It unhappily led him to renew that demand for the crown-matrimonial which had been made the occasion of so much misfortune. He had mortally offended

[1] Chalmers, ii. 469, *note*.

the Catholic party by the death of Riccio and the dispersion of their Parliament. They tried to bear with him for sake of the Queen. But obviously no persuasion on earth could have induced them to trust him with kingly power. Murray, and the other allies whom Darnley had betrayed were not likely to sit still while he reaped the reward which they had promised and he had forfeited. The whole power of the Crown could not have carried such a measure through Parliament.

He and the Queen had issued proclamations to hold courts of justice in person throughout the realm, and especially on the Borders,[1] and the time came when these courts were to be held. Darnley now refused to accompany her.—Mary trembled when the matrimonial crown was again brought under discussion. She could not forget the terrible events of which the same demand and similar conduct of the King had been the precursors. And whenever she heard of him being in communication with any of the nobles she dreaded an explosion. Few of them were disposed to have much connection with him: the loyal despised him for his

[1] The proclamation by the King and Queen to pass to Jedburgh is dated at Alloway, 28th July 1566. On 31st July 1566 there is an entry in the Privy Council minutes—"The King and Queen being of mind, God willing, to be present at the justice ayre at Jedburgh the 16th August." On 8th August the King and Queen continue the justice ayre at Jedburgh to 19th October, owing to the "present season of the year and the time of harvest approaching." By proclamation of 24th September the day was changed to 8th October.

treatment of his wife, the disloyal had his treachery to avenge.—The Border courts were intended to be a great state progress to crush the disorders of these districts. Every man who was fit to bear arms in the adjoining counties had been summoned to meet the King and Queen at Jedburgh; and Mary deeply felt the affront which Darnley put upon her, by forcing her to appear as a deserted wife on such an occasion. But this was not all: Lethington's restoration had roused a spirit of obstinacy in Darnley's character which had not hitherto exhibited itself. He refused to come under the same roof with Murray, Lethington, and Athol. He was indeed a puppet in the hands of his father, the Earl of Lennox, who was more cunning, but seems to have been no wiser than himself.[1] Darnley finally announced his intention to quit the kingdom. Mary pleaded with him for a whole night without success. She assembled her Council and sent for the French ambassador the next morning, and entreated Darnley in their presence to declare whether she had offended him. The French ambassador describes what passed in a letter which is still in existence.[2] He says—"She took him by the hand, and besought him for God's sake to declare if she had given him any occasion for this resolution, and entreated he might deal plainly and not spare her." The lords also, and the ambassador, made similar appeals to him, and at last the King declared that he had

[1] See Randolph's letter, 4th July 1565 (Keith, Spott., ii. 314).

[2] 15th October 1566 (Keith, Spottiswoode edition, vol. ii. 448; Chalmers, ii. 194).

no ground at all; but he went away, saying to the Queen, "Adieu, madame; you shall not see my face for a long time." The ambassador adds: "There is not one person in all this kingdom, from the highest to the lowest, that regards him any further than is agreeable to the Queen; and I never saw her Majesty so much beloved, esteemed, and honoured, nor so great a harmony amongst all her subjects, as at present is, by her wise conduct."

The Privy Council also have left on record their account of this matter, which is the more valuable because the same men at a later period attempted, for their own objects, to cast discredit on the Queen.[1] They testify that, "so far as things could come to their knowledge, the King had no ground of complaint, but, on the contrary, that he had reason to look upon himself as one of the most fortunate princes in Christendom, could he but know his own happiness." They added, "that although they who did perpetrate the murder of her faithful servant had entered her chamber with his knowledge, having followed him close at the back, and had named him the chief of their enterprize, yet would she never accuse him thereof, but did always excuse him, and willed to appear as if she believed it not; and so far was she from ministering to him occasion of discontent that, on the contrary, he had all the reason in the world to thank God for giving him so wise and virtuous a person as she

[1] Their letter to Queen-Mother of France, 8th October 1566 Chalmers, ii. 189).

had showed herself in all her actions." The same paper records the fact that the King had refused to enter the palace, on account of the presence of three of the councillors,[1] and that the Queen condescended so far as to go to meet him outside of the palace, and so conducted him into her own apartment, where he remained all night. There were twelve privy councillors present on this occasion, but Bothwell was not there, having gone to Liddesdale, as lord-lieutenant of the district, to make preparation for the justice courts which were now at hand.

[1] Mr. Froude says the three were Murray, Lethington, and Argyle—not Athol (viii. 300).

CHAPTER XIII.

What did Darnley mean by his threat to quit the country? Obviously he knew the hold which he had of the Queen's affections, and by advice of his cold-hearted father he trafficked on it to compel her to concede an impossibility. He knew that, in spite of all that had passed, his absence would in her eyes be a great calamity. If she had wished to be quit of him, as her enemies afterwards said, his threat to go would not have distressed her as it did. She would have been thankful to him in that case for leaving the country. The mean game of the father and son was to put a strain on her affections to force her into compliance. But when she was counselled to let him "take his swing," what happened? He hired ships; he made ostentatious preparations to embark; but he never put his foot on board. He kept up the game at intervals for several months, and, as we shall find afterwards, he gave in at last, when he found that all the world except his wife looked on him with contempt.

Mary was now obliged to proceed to Jedburgh, unsupported by her husband, to hold the courts for pacifying the Border which she had concerted with him, and proclaimed so long before. At the last

public ceremony in which she asked his presence he had withheld it in the same way, and it was connected in her mind with a frightful calamity.—The circuit-town was crowded. She had summoned "the lords, barons, freeholders, landed men, gentlemen, and substantial yeomen of Edinburgh, Haddington, Berwick, Selkirk, Peebles, Lanark, Linlithgow, Stirling, Clackmannan, Kinross, and Fife, well boden in war," with twenty days' provisions, to meet her in aid of the authority of the law, and they had come.[1] But when the day arrived, the elaborate preparations were threatened with ridicule in a way which nobody could have dreamt of. There were no criminals upon whom to administer justice.[2] The lord-lieutenant, Bothwell, had been struck down and dangerously wounded in conflict with one of the Border ruffians whom he had been sent to capture, and the whole of his prisoners had escaped. Here was a dilemma for the mortified Queen; and her lieutenant, the chief magistrate of the district, who alone could advise what was best to be done, was lying disabled at his castle of Hermitage.

[1] The circuit-town was so crowded that special arrangements had to be made by the Privy Council to secure provisions.

[2] Mr. Tytler says (vol. vii. 58) that Mary opened her court at Jedburgh on 8th October, and that she was occupied uninterruptedly from that day till the 15th in the proceedings against the delinquents. But the minutes of the Privy Council on 11th October show that no person had brought forward any charge, and in consequence the Council then ordained all who were aggrieved to lodge informations with the Justice-Clerk.

Mary's spirit rose with the occasion. She took horse and, accompanied by Murray, Lethington, and the rest of her Privy Council and attendants, galloped across the country to consult him in this emergency. She remained two hours at Hermitage, accomplished the necessary arrangements for preventing the defeat of justice, and rode back immediately to Jedburgh.[1] We know from a letter of the time that her communication with Bothwell at Hermitage took place entirely in presence of Murray and the other lords who were with her.[2] This visit, thus accompanied, and paid under these circumstances, was afterwards twisted by Mary's enemies into evidence of inordinate passion for Bothwell. It occurred eleven days after he had been wounded. Murray, who with his wife attended her on that occasion, gave his countenance in after-times, when he had usurped her government and she was a prisoner in England, to the publication of an

[1] "7th Oct. 1566.—Queen and nobilitie went to Jedburgh to hold justice ayre. Bothwell was sent by our soveraines to apprehend certain malefactors and bring them to the justice ayre. Caught John Eliot of the Park, who tried to escape. Bothwell pursued and fell in a sheugh (ditch) hurt, and swooned, after he had shot a pistol at Eliot. Eliot, seeing him fall, gave him three wounds—one in the body, one in the head, and one in the hand. Eliot died of his wound. The other thieves in custody at Hermitage, hearing what had happened, *broke out*, and *Bothwell could not get into his own house till they got free.*"

"15th Oct. 1566.—Queen rode from Jedburgh to Hermitage and spake with Earl, and returned same night" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*).

[2] Calig. b. iv. 104 *dorso ;* Tytler, vii. 59, *note.*

infamous libel in which it was said that the Queen, on hearing of Bothwell's wound, "flung away in haist lyke ane mad woman be great journeys in post, in the schairp tyme of winter, first to Melrose, and then to Jedburgh;" and though she there "heard sure news of his life, dispysing all discommodities of the way and wedder, and all dangers of theiffs, sche betuke herself heidlang to hir jornay" (to see Bothwell) "with ane company as na man of ony honest degree would have adventured his life and his gudes amang them."[1]

[1] This is a favourable specimen of the scandalous and declamatory publication which Buchanan called his *Detection of Mary*. It was always suspected that he was hired by Elizabeth's ministers to write it for the purpose of discrediting Mary with the Catholic party in England. It may now be taken as certain; Buchanan's name stands on the English pension-lists for £100 a-year. A curious list of pensions will be found in the Appendix No. XVIII.

CHAPTER XIV.

MARY's exertions, and her distress at her husband's unreasonable conduct, threw her into a fever at Jedburgh, and she was brought to the brink of the grave. For several hours she lay as if dead, and her life was long despaired of.[1] Lethington wrote from Jedburgh that she had looked for nothing but death. He adds—"The occasion of the Q. seikness, sa far as I understand, is cumed off thought and displeasour, and I trow by that I could wring farther off hir awne declaration to me, the rote off it is the Kyng."[2]

The King heard of her illness; but still trafficking on her affection and hoping to wring from her a consent to his demands, he was slow to come to her. She was greatly mortified by this apparent coldness. He confessed to the French ambassador that he wished her to *send* for him, and the ambassador replied that he didn't doubt the Queen's goodness, but that

[1] When the Queen thought herself dying she sent for her ministers, recommended them to act together in peace after her death, and urged them to be tolerant in matters of religion. "It's a sair thing," she said, "to have the conscience pressed in sic a matter" (Letter, Bishop of Ross to Archbishop of Glasgow; Keith's Appendix).

[2] Lethington to Archbishop of Glasgow, 24th October 1566 (Sloane Coll. 3199, near middle, marked at top "Mem. Scotland," vol. ii. C. S. D.)

there were few women who, after his conduct, would seek after him. At last, when she was out of danger, he made his appearance at her bedside. She affected to return his indifference, and did not ask him to remain. He left next day.—Sir James Melville tells us that she at that time made her will. Her judgment counselled her to place her child under the care of Queen Elizabeth, to secure him the best prospect of succeeding to that English crown for which she herself had so long looked in vain. But there remains a remarkable evidence, recently discovered, of the true state of her feelings in regard to her husband, in the inventories of her jewels, opposite to each article in which she wrote the name of the person to whom she bequeathed it. Twenty-five of these she left to her husband; and there is one cherished ring opposite which she has written—"It is the ring with which I was betrothed. I leave it to the King who gave it to me." Yet it is pretended that she was then planning his murder.

Murray, Lethington, Bothwell, Huntly, and Argyle afterwards went together to the Queen at Craigmillar, and besought her to divorce Darnley. She refused.[1] This was in November; and in December Forster writes to Cecil—"The King and Queen is presently at Craigmillar."[2]

The time soon arrived for the baptism.[3] Queen

[1] See *infra*, Chap. XXVI. and Appendix No. XIX.

[2] 11th December 1566, Forster to Cecil (Robertson's Appendix).

[3] 17th December 1566.

Elizabeth sent a special ambassador with a large font of silver gilt, and charged him to do all honour to the Queen and Prince, but to treat Darnley as an English subject. This affront, which Mary was not in a position to resent without risking the prospects of her child, made it impossible for Darnley to be present at the ceremony.[1] He himself explained this to the French ambassador,[2] but Mary's libellers have actually printed and circulated all over the world that she refused him a suit of clothes in which he could appear! Mr. Tytler states the fact of his absence at the baptism, but overlooks its true cause, and imputes it to the hostility of Bothwell and others, for which there is no foundation. The child was baptized with the ceremonies of the Church of Rome; the English ambassador, with Bothwell and some of the other Protestant lords, refusing to enter the chapel.[3]

Bothwell had repeatedly taken a lead in resisting Mary's persuasions to her officers to attend the mass. Randolph has recorded that at the previous Candlemas the Queen was bent on making a great demonstration in her chapel,[4] and required the attendance of some of her lords at the mass, that several refused, "Bothwell the stoutest of them all." And at his own mar-

[1] Wright, i. 607. [2] Labanoff, i. 378; Strickland, v. 68.

[3] "My Lords Huntly, Murray, Bothwell, nor the English ambassador came not within the chapel, because it was done against the points of their religion" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*, 17th December 1566).

[4] 7th February 1566 (Rob. App. 252).

riage with Huntly's sister in spring, in the palace, he risked the Queen's anger by refusing the Popish form. Knox tells us—"The Queen desired that the marriage might be made in the chapel at the mass, which the Earl Bothwell would in nowise grant."[1]

Strong representations were made to Mary by Queen Elizabeth, that she should now signalise the young Prince's baptism by extending her clemency to Morton and his associates. The English succession seemed to be in a fair way of being settled, and this gave great weight to Elizabeth's wishes. The king of France was also urgent. Murray and Lethington pressed it strongly, and even Bothwell and Huntly (whom Mary could not suspect of undue affection for the conspirators who had sought their own lives) joined with the rest. The whole of her councillors were of the same mind, and Mary had to yield. Andrew Carr of Faudonside, who had put his pistol to the Queen's breast, was excepted from the pardon.

The French ambassador wrote of Darnley—"His bad deportment is incurable."[2] He had sent three times to ask a meeting with the ambassador, who was obliged at last to intimate that there were two passages to his apartments, and that if his Majesty should enter by the one, he, the ambassador, would be constrained to go out by the other.

Darnley was much offended, perhaps alarmed, at

[1] Knox, vol. ii. Woodrow edition, 529. See also Drury's letter in Appendix hereto, No. VIII.

[2] Chalmers, ii. 198. 23d December 1566.

the pardon of Morton, Archibald Douglas, and their seventy-five associates. If he had told the whole truth to the Queen she might have shared his anxiety. He immediately left the Court, and proceeded to Glasgow, where his father resided. This was within a day or two after the French ambassador had so plainly reprobated his conduct. The Earl of Mar is said to have warned Darnley at this time that Murray had a design on his life, and this has been given as an explanation of the suddenness of his departure. But the restoration of so large a body of desperate men whom he had betrayed after holding secret relations with them, was enough to suggest danger to him without such confirmation. He became very ill on reaching Glasgow. Spots broke out all over his body, and the Queen sent her own physician to him, who found that he had small-pox.[1]

[1] State Paper Office—Bedford to Cecil, 9th January 1567 (Cal. xiii. 3).

CHAPTER XV.

JAMES was destined to be the first sovereign who should unite the three kingdoms under one crown. His baptism was full of hope to Mary. She saw in Elizabeth's acceptance of the office of godmother a recognition of her son as the ultimate heir of England. Elizabeth's aim, on the other hand, had been to obtain the restoration of Morton and his confederates. She did not hesitate to play off Mary's hopes as a mother against her indignation as a queen and her feelings as a wife. Elizabeth thus succeeded in satisfying Morton, while she mortified Darnley, and bound herself to nothing. Having gained her objects, she resumed her old policy. The ambassador, whom she had commissioned to negotiate as to the succession, courteously withdrew. He left the kindest assurances of goodwill, and of a friendly solution—in the future.

But the English Parliament had become urgent to have the succession settled. A dangerous illness which Elizabeth had suffered some time before had drawn attention to the perils of a doubtful succession. The opposing factions joined in the wish that Mary's title should be recognised,[1] and the birth of James

[1] Labanoff, i. 357.

strengthened the popular leaning in her favour.[1] Elizabeth had committed herself so far as to say that she would proceed in the question before Parliament rose.[2] Cecil was in want of a pretext to release her from this pledge, which she had no mind to fulfil. She had been so much irritated by the Parliamentary pressure which was put upon her, that she had vowed she would take a husband "who would not be to the taste of some of them."[3]

Mary's health was broken, though she had borne up nobly under the petulant conduct of her husband. Le Croc, the French ambassador, reported to his Court on 23d December 1566[4]:—"I do believe the principal part of her disease to consist in a deep grief and sorrow; nor does it seem possible to make her forget the same. Still she repeats these words—'I could wish to be dead.' * * * The Queen behaved admirably well all the time of the baptism, and showed so much earnestness to entertain all the goodly company in the best manner, that this made her forget in a good measure all her former ailments. But I am

[1] "All England then bore her Majesty great reverence" (Melville's *Memoirs*).

De Silva, in a letter to Philip of Spain, 26th Oct. 1566, says—"The Scotch Queen has much credit with the good all over the realm" (England). The English peers were unanimously for Mary (Froude, viii. 319).

[2] Mary's letter to Elizabeth, 3d January 1566-7 (Labanoff, i. 389).

[3] Froude, viii. 316.

[4] Le Croc, 23d December 1566, published by Chalmers, ii. 198; Tytler, vii. 67; Keith, pref. 7.

of the mind, however, that she will give us some trouble yet; nor can I be brought to think otherwise so long as she continues so pensive and melancholy. She sent for me yesterday, and I found her laid on the bed weeping sore. * * * I am much grieved for the many troubles and vexations she meets with."

Darnley's illness was a new addition to her trials. The most agitating rumours were also put into circulation: one that he had been poisoned; another that he and Lennox had embarked in a new plot to depose her, crown the prince, and establish Darnley as his father in the government. The former rumour is explained by the pustules of small-pox; the latter was communicated to the Queen herself by William Walker, a servant of the Archbishop of Glasgow.[1]

Murray, Lethington, and others, working on Mary's fears, now urged her, though she had rejected their plan of divorce, to proceed against Darnley for treason.[2] But she would not listen to their proposal, though much disquieted. An old writer says that they presented to her for signature a warrant for Darnley's imprisonment; and means were taken, on the other hand, to convey to him that she was about to send him to prison. One of the letters which was afterwards produced against Mary represents Darnley as telling

[1] Mary's letter to Archbishop of Glasgow, 20th January 1566-7 (Labanoff, i. 396).

[2] "They offered to get him convict of treason because he consented to her Grace's retention in ward, . . . quhilk altogeddir her Grace refusit, as is manifestlie known" (*Instructions by Thirty of the Scottish Lords and Prelates, etc.*, Goodall, ii. 359).

her in Glasgow that he had heard of this warrant, and of her refusal to subscribe it.[1] No effort was spared to widen the breach between them.

Thus harassed, she took the frank and simple-hearted course of going to her erring husband. Her decision must have been sudden, and was probably the result of impulse. She had written to the Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador in France, on 20th January 1566-7. She told him what had been declared by Walker, his servant,[2] in regard to the King; and her letter contains no hint of any expectation to see her husband soon. Yet in a few days

[1] Goodall, ii. 11. Darnley (according to Crawford's evidence, who got his information from Darnley himself) said to the Queen at Glasgow, when they were conversing about their differences and the rumours which had been current—"The laird of Minto told me 'that a letter was presented to you at Craigmillar, made, as he said, by your device, and subscribed by certain others, *who desired you to subscribe the same, which you refused to do;* and I could never believe that you, who are my own proper flesh, would do me any hurt; and if any other would do it, they should buy it dear, unless they took me sleeping'" (Crawford's deposition, quoted by Strickland, v. 123).

[2] "Lately a servand of yours, named William Walcar, came to our presens, being for the time at Sterveling, and in his communication, amangis utheris thingis, declarit to us how it was not only oppinly bruted, but also he had hard be report of personis quhome he esteemit luffaris of us, that the King, be the assistance of sum of our nobilitie, suld tak the Prince our sone and crown him, and being crownit, as his father suld tak upon him the government, with sum utheris attemptates and purpozes to this fyne" (Mary's letter to Archbishop of Glasgow, 20th January 1566-7; Laban. i. 396). Walker named William Heigate, town-clerk of Glasgow, as his authority.

afterwards, she was at his bedside in Glasgow. Drury wrote to Cecil from Berwick on 23d January—"The Lord Darly lyeth sick at Glasgo of the small-pocks, unto whom the Queen came yesterday. That disease beginneth to spread there."[1]

The physician whom she sent to Darnley would naturally explain to his patient what is repeatedly noticed in the correspondence of the time, that his wife's spirits and health had given way. He very probably gave his opinion of the cause, which undoubtedly was vexation on her husband's account; and if there was a spark of right feeling in Darnley he could not fail to be touched by it. He had written some months before to the Pope proposing an energetic effort to restore the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, and Father Edmonds, the Principal of the Jesuits, had come from Italy.[2] If further mediation was needed, it was thus at hand. At all events, through some channel, Darnley seems to have conveyed to his

[1] This is quoted from Tytler, vii. 442. Chalmers quotes the letter differently. He makes it—"Unto whom, I hear, the Queen intendeth to go and bring him away as soon as he can bear the cold air" (Chalmers, ii. 178; Jebb, ii. 59). The author has hitherto been unable to trace any letter in the State Paper Office containing either of the passages. There is a letter in the State Paper Office (xiii. 3) by Bedford to Cecil, 9th January 1566-7—"The King is now at Glasgo wt. his father, and there lyeth full of the small pokes, to whom the Queen hath sent her phisician." Murray's diary (Goodall, ii. 247) represents the Queen as leaving Edinburgh on 21st, and on the way meeting Crauford (see *infra*) on the 23d.

[2] Strickland, v. 116.

wife, soon after the 20th of January, an expression of repentance for the conduct by which he had so much distressed her. The Bishop of Ross, who was much in Mary's confidence, writes that, "hearing her husband was repentant, and desired her presence, she, without delay, hasted with such speed as she conveniently might to visit him at Glasgow." It is certain that she found him most humble and penitent, willing to be advised by her in all things; which is a state of mind so unlike anything we have hitherto seen of him, as to be nearly conclusive that she went in compliance with an entreaty from him. If she had gone unasked, he would no doubt have been very glad to see her, but he was not the man to be humble in that case. When she had been urged to divorce him and refused, she had said, "Peradventure he may change opinion, and acknowledge himself." He had now done so.

Though her going was sudden, it appears that she was not unexpected. Darnley's father sent to meet her on the way. Mr. Froude and Mr. Tytler have both fallen into the mistake of representing the messenger as sent by Darnley, not by his father. It is a very serious mistake, for they transfer by it to Darnley some bitter and well-deserved observations which Mary made to the messenger in regard to Lennox, on account of his having misled Darnley, and helped to make so much mischief between them. Through this mistake, these two eminent historians have been led to the conclusion

that when she went to Glasgow, as if to be reconciled to her husband, her heart was really full of rancour. They have put this in the front of their case against her; and it appears to have swayed them both, and indeed to have started them off in a false groove, which has led them wrong to the end.[1] The nature of the message should have guarded them against such a grievous error. The Earl of Lennox

[1] Mr. Froude's account of this meeting is very graphic, but in so far as regards its application to Darnley, highly imaginative. He says—"The news that she was on her way to Glasgow anticipated her appearance there. Darnley was still confined to his room; but, hearing of her approach, he sent a gentleman who was in attendance on him, named Crawford, a noble, fearless kind of person, to apologise for his inability to meet her. It seems that, after hearing of the bond at Craigmillar, *he* had written some letter to her, the inconvenient truths of which had been irritating; and she had used certain bitter expressions *about him* which had been carried to his ears. *His heart half sunk in him when he was told that she was coming!* and Crawford, when he gave his message, did not hide from her that his master was afraid of her.

"'There is no remedy against fear,' the Queen said shortly.

"'Madam,' Crawford answered, 'I know so far of my master, that he desires nothing more than that the secrets of every creature's heart were writ in their faces.'

"Crawford's suspicions were too evident to be concealed. The Queen did not like them. She asked sharply if he had more to say? and when he said he had discharged his commission, she bade him hold his peace" (Froude, viii. 353).

We have two original descriptions of this meeting. A letter imputed to Mary herself gives the following account of it:—

"Estant encor à quatre mille pas de la ville, vint a moy un gentilhomme *envoyè par le Conte de Lenos*, qui me salva *en son nom;* et l'excusa de ce qu'il ne m'estoit venu au devant, disant,

was her lieutenant, whose duty it was to meet and escort her, and his message was, that he could not venture to come, which was no great wonder, as she

qu'il ne l'avoit osé entreprendre, á cause que j'avoye tensé Cunningham avec paroles aigres. Il me demanda aussi que je m'enquisse de soupçon que j'avoye *contre iceluy Conte.* Ceste derniere partie de son dire avoit esté adjoustée par luy, sans que le Conte luy eust commandé.

"Je respondy, *qu'il n'y avoit point de remede contre la crainte ;* et que s'il estoit hors de faute, il ne seroit pas tant timide ; et que je n'avoye point respondu asprement sinon aux doutes qui estoient en ses lettres. En somme, j'imposay silence au personnage" (Goodall, ii. 1).

In the Scotch abstract of this letter usually published with it (Goodall, ii. 16), this passage is described as "*The Message of the Father in the Gait* (way)." "Nuncius patris in itinere."

Crawford's account of the meeting was given in to Elizabeth's Commissioners as evidence against Mary, and remains in the State Paper Office (Scotland, vol. xiii. No. 14). He is described in the minutes of the Commissioners (Goodall, ii. 245) as "one Thomas Crawford, a gentleman of the Earl of Lennox—the same party of whom mention is made in a long lettre written in French, where it is said, about the beginning of the same lettre, that a gentleman of the Earl of Lenox met the party that wrote the lettre about four miles from the place where the lettre was written." Crawford's statement says :—

"The words betwixt the Q. and me Thomas Craufurd bye the waye as she came to Glasgo to fetch the King, when *my L. my master* sent me to shew her the cause why he came not to meet her himself. First I maid mye L. mye master's humble commendationns unto her Ma^{ty}, with the excuse that he came not to meet her, requesting her Grace not to think it was—[*illegible*]—or yet for not knowing his duty towards her Highness, but only for want of helth at the present, and also that he would not presume to come in her presence until he knew farther her mind because of the sharp words that she had spoken of him to

had forbidden him her presence;[1] but Darnley, who could not stir from his bed, and whom the Queen was going to for that very reason, had no need to send an apology for not coming to meet her.

She remained at Glasgow in close attendance on him till about the 28th of January, and then returned to Edinburgh, bringing him by easy stages in a litter which had been prepared for the purpose. She could not take him to Holyrood, lest the infection should be

Robert Cunningham, his servant, in Stirling, whereby he thought he was in Her Ma^tie's displeasure,—notwithstanding he hath sent his servants and friends to wait upon Her Matie.

"She answered that there was no receipt against fear. I answered that my L. had no fear for the things he knew in himself, but onlie of the rude and unkind words she had spoken to his servant. She answered and said that he would not be afraid in case he were not culpable. I answered that I knew so farr of his *Lordship* that he desired nothing more than that the secrets of every creture's harte were written in their face.

"She asked me if I had any farther commission!

"I answered No.

"Then she commanded me to hold my peace."

At Bothwell's trial "there appeared Robert Cuningham, who called himself servant to the said Mathew Earl of Lenox," and made protestation in his master's name, "the said Robert Cuningham being proxy from the Earl of Lennox" (State Trials, vol. i. 80). And Crawford himself is stated by Drury to have also appeared for Lennox at the trial (Drury to Cecil, 15th April, 1567; Chalmers, ii. 246).

Murray's Diary bears "January 23: The Quene came to Glasgow, and on the rode met her Thomas Crawford, from the Erle of Lennox," &c.

[1] "The Earl of Lennox came not in the Queen's sight since the death of Davy" (Forster to Cecil, 8th Sept. 1566; Robertson, Appendix).

communicated to her child. She proposed to take him to Craigmillar, but he was unwilling to go there, and a lodging at the Kirk of Field was finally selected for him. Mr. Froude represents Darnley as anxious to go to Craigmillar and prevented by the Queen; but Darnley's servant, Thomas Nelson, who accompanied them from Glasgow, says distinctly, "it was devised in Glasgow that the King should have lain first at Craigmillar; but because he hadna will thereof the purpose was altered, and conclusion taken that he should lye beside the Kirk of Field."[1] Upon this mistake also Mr. Froude founds inferences against the Queen.

The grounds of the Kirk of Field are now occupied by the University and by the buildings which lie between it and the old High School at Edinburgh. The ground to the south, now covered by the growth of the city, was then unbuilt upon. It was considered the most salubrious site in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh; and its character in that respect came down to much later times, for about sixty years ago it was chosen as the best site for the Royal Infirmary. Here

[1] Nelson's deposition (Goodall, ii. 244).—Another of Mr. Froude's mistakes is amusing. He represents Darnley as so jealous of his wife that he could not bear her familiarity with some of her Lords "which kept most company with her." On referring to the original document which Mr. Froude quotes, the word which he has printed "Lords" is unmistakeably "*Ladies!*" "the Ladies of Arguile, Murrey, and Marre, who kept most company with her." The date is August 1566. The document is in the State Paper Office; Scotland; Elizabeth, vol. xii. 99, A 1.

Mary attended on her husband every day, generally returning to Holyrood at night to be with her child, but occasionally remaining for the night at the Kirk of Field.

Their reconciliation boded ill for those who had set discord between them. It brought things back to the position of which Elizabeth's ambassador had written a year and a half before, "they (the confederates) see nothing but God must send him a short end or them a miserable life." The chief differences were that, in the interval, they had practised themselves in high-handed murder, and Darnley had betrayed them to the brink of ruin. Apart from the Queen, Darnley was powerless. But his restoration to her confidence must have roused the fears as well as the hatred of his enemies, and not least of those whose grants of the Crown lands were still revocable. For Mary had now entered on the last of the four years allowed to her by law for making revocation; and probably nothing but the divisions between her and her husband had delayed this customary measure so long.

CHAPTER XVI.

At this time the Lord Robert Stuart, the abbot of Holyrood-house, who was Murray's half-brother, communicated to Darnley that there was a plot against his life. Darnley at once reported it to the Queen. She did what any sensible and loyal woman would do in the same circumstances; she sent for the Lord Robert, to have it inquired into at once,—with the help of Murray and her Council. The Lord Robert denied what he had said. Darnley gave him the lie; weapons were drawn; and the Queen had to call on Murray to interpose between them. The Lord Robert was highly incensed, and she had much difficulty in preventing further mischief. She had to go to his chambers at Holyrood to negotiate a reconciliation, after she left Darnley on that night. There is a beautiful letter of hers which she seems to have sent to Darnley from Holyrood on the night of this occurrence.[1] One may perceive in it, with a touch of jealousy, for which he had given too much occasion, an outpouring of wifely affection which was very suitable to Darnley's state at the

[1] Murray's Diary says it was sent on 7th February, and that on the 8th, she again "confronted the King and my Lord of Halyruidhouse, conforme to her letter wryttin the nycht befoir" (Goodall, ii. $\frac{248}{2}$; February 7 and 8).

time, and which gives a clear insight into the true state of her heart. She says :

"I would not have sat so late, above, had it not been to find out what the bearer will tell you, which I find the best means to settle our affair. I have promised a meeting to-morrow. See to it, if you think well of it.

"I have now broken our arrangement, for you forbade me to write or send to you. Nevertheless I have not done it to offend you ; and if you knew how much I am alarmed at this time you would not entertain so many vexatious suspicions, which, however, I bear, and take in good part, as arising from that which I desire most of all things under heaven, and seek with the utmost diligence to win, the knowledge of your affection —of which I would assure myself by devotion to my many duties toward you. For my part I shall never despair ; and I pray that, as you promised, you will make me sensible of your attachment. Otherwise I shall conceive that my unhappy destiny, and the better stars of those who yet have not a third part of my fidelity and of my willing obedience to you, have in my despite given them the first place in your favour, as if I were another supplanted love of Jason—not that I would liken you to him for unhappiness, or myself to her for cruelty ; and yet you constrain me to be in some measure like her in all those things which touch you, or which can keep and preserve you to her to whom alone you rightfully belong, for I may well claim you as my own who alone have won you loyally, and have loved you so singly as I do, and shall do while I live ;

strengthening myself by my love against all the pains and dangers which can come of it. And for all the evils of which you have been the cause to me, return me this proof of your affection, that you keep in your remembrance the place which is hard by.[1]

"I don't ask you to keep your promise to me to-morrow, but that we meet, and that you don't yield to suspicion without proof. I ask no other thing of God but that you may know what is in my heart, which is yours,—and that He may preserve you from all evil, at least so long as I have life, which indeed I do not value except so far as I and it are acceptable to you.

"I now go to bed and commit you to God. Let me know early in the morning how you are, for I shall be in anxiety until I hear of you. Like a bird escaped from the cage, or the dove without its mate, I shall remain alone to lament your absence, however short it may be. This unsought letter will do what I cannot myself, if by chance, as I fear, you are not yet asleep. I did not venture to write it before Joseph, Sebastian, and Joachim—they were just leaving when I began."

This beautiful letter was written in French. It is given here with all the disadvantages of a translation. Beautiful as it is, with the ring of true feeling, and suitable only between a wife and husband, it was afterwards made one of the chief instruments of her ruin.

[1] Probably the place where their child was. But it may be an allusion to the place of Riccio's death, to keep Darnley in remembrance of the terrible consequences of such unjust suspicions as are alluded to in her letter.

It is not dated, signed, or addressed, but her accusers have always represented it as written by her[1] within three days of Darnley's death.

Two days later[2] she remained at his bedside till midnight. She put a ring on his finger and kissed him, when she left him. She had promised to grace the marriage of one of her household, and went to Holyrood to keep her promise.[3]

There was speeding towards her through the night a despatch from her ambassador at Paris, which did not reach her till morning :—

"The ambassador of Spaigne requests me to advertise you to tak heid to yourself. I have had sum murmuring in likeways be others, that there be sum surprise to be transacted in your contrair, but he would never let me know of nae particular, only assured me he had written to his M^y^ to know gif be that way he can try any farder, and that he was adverteesit

[1] Murray's Diary ; Goodall 2, 248—7th February.

[2] Sunday, 9th February 1566-7.

[3] "The King being lodged at one end of the city of Edinburgh and the Queen at the other, the said lady came to see him on a Sunday evening, which was the 9th of this month, about seven o'clock, with all the principal lords of her Court, and after having remained with him two or three hours, she withdrew to attend the bridal of one of her gentlemen, according to her promise ; and if she had not made that promise, it is believed that she would have remained till twelve or one o'clock with him, seeing the good understanding and union in which the said lady Queen and the King her husband had been living for the last three weeks" (Report by Clernault, the French envoy ; Strickland, vol. v. 163).

and counsellit to cause me haist towards you herewith."[1]

This warning was written at Paris a fortnight before, while Mary was with her husband in Glasgow, and necessarily proceeded on information which had previously travelled from Scotland to Paris. But it came a few hours too late. The catastrophe was over before it was delivered to the Queen.

[1] Letter, Archbishop of Glasgow, from Paris, to the Queen, dated 27th January 1567, which arrived on the morning after Darnley's murder (MS. Sloane, 3199, British Museum).

CHAPTER XVII.

On Monday 10th February 1566-7, about three o'clock in the morning, a terrific explosion startled the city of Edinburgh. It was some time before it was discovered what had happened. By and by the cry came to the palace that the king's house at Kirk of Field had been destroyed. The people rushed to the spot; the house was lying in ruins; even the foundation-stones had been torn up.[1] A drawing of it made at the time represents the walls and roof as lying in a broken heap together, and not scattered to any distance. One man, a servant of the king, was dug alive out of the ruins. He had been fast asleep when the explosion took place, and could tell nothing. The dead bodies of two others were found buried among the rubbish. These three had slept in a small chamber near the king's, under a separate roof. For some hours no trace of the king

[1] Clernault's report describes the explosion as resembling "une vollee de vingt cinq ou trente canons"—"logis le dict Sr. Roy lequel entrouva, toutallement raze, puis cherchant où il pourrait etre le trouvaient a soixante ou quatre vingt pas de ledict maison mort et estandu en ung jardin aussi ung vallet de chambre et ung jeune paige.

"La chose estant rapportée ainsi a ceste pauvre princesse chūn peult penser en quelle peine et agonie ou elle s'est trouvée, mesmes que telle malauventure est advenue au temps que sa Ma^{tie} et le roy estoient au meilleur mesnaige que l'on pourroit desirée ce sorte

could be obtained, but as the grey light of morning began to dawn, his dead body was discovered in a garden eighty yards from the house. The attendant who slept in the room with him was lying dead at a short distance further away. Each had on a night-shirt. There was not a fracture, contusion, or livid mark, nor any trace of fire on their bodies, and the king's clothes were laying folded beside him. A fur pelisse, open as if dropped, was lying near him. The distance and relative positions of the bodies of the king and his attendant were observed to be nearly the same as when they lay in their chamber.[1]

An old woman saw eight men leaving the Kirk of Field between two and three o'clock in the morning, "after the crack rose." She snatched at the cloak of one of them, calling them traitors, as they ran past. The cloak was of silk, and there was armour under it. The same gang were seen running away by others. It is also said in a contemporaneous paper, recently found in Italy, that cries were heard of "*Mercy, my cousins!*" Beyond this all was mystery.

que le dict Sr. de Clernault la laissée affligée autant que le peult estre une des plus mal fortunées roynes de ce monde. Ou c'est bien apperçu que tel malheureuse entreprize procedoit d'une mine soutz terre—toutefois elle na point encores este trouvee, encores monis scait on qui en est lantheux."

Clernault was in Edinburgh at the time it occurred. This report (unpublished) is in the State Paper Office (Scotland, Elizabeth, vol. xiii. p. 13).

[1] Drury to Cecil, 28th February 1567 (Tytler, vii. 447).

The Queen issued a proclamation, declaring that rather than the horrible deed should be unpunished, she "would lose life and all;"[1] and offering a reward, a landed living worth £2000 at least, and a free pardon, for information; but none came.

There was an early attempt to give a direction to the public suspicions. Night after night cries were heard in the dark, and placards were stuck up on the walls, charging the Queen and Bothwell, and even Murray, and many more; but there were two men who were not named, who kept themselves clear of suspicion, who had the most deadly cause of quarrel with Darnley, who stood by Bothwell for a time, yet by and by stepped forward as avengers of Darnley's death, chased Bothwell out of the country, imprisoned the Queen, charged her at last with the murder, and rose to the highest positions in the State. Both, but a few weeks before Darnley's death, had been banished men, subject to forfeiture for their treason; they were the chiefs of that body of the conspirators whose restoration Darnley had so anxiously resisted. These two men were James Earl of Morton and Archibald Douglas, his and Darnley's cousin. The one after Murray's death, and the lapse of a few years more, succeeded

[1] This proclamation is dated 11th February (Brit. Mus. Sloane Coll. 3199). Its phraseology was echoed by the Archbishop of Glasgow in a subsequent letter to the Queen, which has been represented by some, who have not observed that the phrase originated with herself, as a bold reproach upon her by her own ambassador.

to the place of Regent; the other, originally a parson, was pushed up by his cousin to the Bench, and became ultimately ambassador at Elizabeth's Court.

Fourteen years passed after the murder (with many changes, of which hereafter), and Darnley's son, King James, approached to manhood. One of his first acts when he escaped from tutelage was to commit the Earl of Morton to the castle of Edinburgh, charged with the murder of Darnley.[1] Archibald Douglas instantly took guilt to himself, and fled to England. Queen Elizabeth made the most frantic efforts to prevent Morton's trial. She endeavoured to stir up insurrection in Scotland; she threatened war; she moved an army to the frontier; she sent back our old friend Randolph, the ambassador of Riccio's time. Her right-hand man, Leicester, wrote to Randolph with no very obscure suggestion that the young King might follow the fate of his father.[2] And close on the heels of that came official notice that Eliza-

[1] 1st January 1581 (State Papers, xxix. 1).

[2] The Earl of Leicester's letter (unpublished) to Thomas Randolph, in reference to the prosecution of Morton by King James, is subjoined:—

"15*th February* 1581.—I have known the day when Mr. Tho—— Ra—— had been able in Scotland to have done much. Well that he is where he was. And let that young K. (King) take heed if he prove unthankful to his faithful servants so soon, he will not long tarry in that soil. Let the speed of his predecessors be his warning.—Your old assured,

"R. Leycester."

—(From the original letter in the State Paper Office—Scotland, xxix. 971.)

beth would assist and maintain the Scots in protection of Morton.

But James owed a debt to the memory of his mur-

This letter was written soon after Morton had been imprisoned on the charge of accession to Darnley's murder. The writer was Elizabeth's secret confidant; the receiver her ambassador in Scotland—the same ambassador who, sixteen years before, concerted Riccio's murder, and sent to Leicester, for Elizabeth's private eye, the remarkable letter on that subject referred to at pp. 49, 50.

The correspondence in the State Paper Office (Scotland, vol. xxviii.) shows that Elizabeth had been very uneasy about Morton for a considerable time before he was actually imprisoned. Various efforts were made by her ambassador to induce him to "put a platt in execution," "to remedy the ticklish state of affairs" (Bowes's *Letters*, 3d and 17th May 1580). At last it was announced that "Morton was ready to execute a platt for the common benefit" (23d May 1580). Then there arose some hesitation, and Walsingham asks: "What pension, think you, will content Morton?" (22d June 1580). Elizabeth herself, with her own hand, writes Morton on the same day that she has heard he is in danger, and requests to know his mind frankly, promising her support to him (No. 38). But Morton either thought his hands were red enough already, or wished to enhance his services. He did not reply to her till 16th July, and then, showing he quite appreciated what she aimed at, he cynically thanks her for *her great care of the King!* but declines to "make out a platt." By and by her ambassador writes that Morton is dissatisfied that Elizabeth gave him only promises (10th August, vol. xxviii. No. 59). Then there is further coquetting with him. "The Queen is discouraged by Morton's suspicious letter." "Morton is resolved not to answer the Queen in writing how far he will employ himself if assured of her Majesty's assistance" (No. 19). Bowes writes (22d August, No. 70) that there was little chance of recovering him "without express deed timely given to his own contentment." This is followed by Walsing-

dered father, to the name of his captive mother, who was then pining in her English prison, and in spite of Elizabeth's threats and violence Morton was brought to

ham's order to Bowes—"if temperate means fail, confer with Morton and other enemies of Lenox (King James's adviser) *to lay violent hands on him and his associates.*" This order was too plain, and it was recalled; and Elizabeth then resolved to try the young King, by hints of an intention to exclude him from the English throne. This fails, and Bowes reports in cipher that "45 (Morton) must be employed at once—words are of no value" (No. 88). The next letter shows that they had become alarmed, suspecting that some of Bowes's letters had been intercepted, and that her Majesty's resolution was consequently suspended. Then came Morton's seizure and imprisonment, followed by the proceedings mentioned in the text, Leycester's letter above inserted, instructions to Randolph how to defend Morton from the charge of murdering the King's father (vol. xxix. No. 5), a private memorial to Randolph to win the captains of Edinburgh and Dumbarton castles to the devotion of Elizabeth (No. 8), a commission by Elizabeth to Hunsdon as Captain-General of the army of the north to invade Scotland. Walsingham stirs up Randolph, a few days before Leycester's letter, by telling him that his "request for a fee-farm may be obtained if he can procure Morton's liberty" (No. 23, 3d February 1581). "The preachers to be instructed to stir up the people's minds" (No. 24). Bowes reports—"Morton's safety is only to be won *by surprising Lenox* and the Court, or by some other *like forcible action.* Queen's forces not sufficient" (No. 42). Walsingham replies with "*Doubts* about using violence—little credit to be got in the matter," . . . "wherein we are very doubtful and irresolute" (No. 44). But even Randolph at last replies—"So much has fallen out against Morton that there is little chance of saving his life." Then Elizabeth tries a compromise—Morton to suffer imprisonment for life, and conditions also for Archibald Douglas (No. 57). But this also fails: Morton suffers; the plots instantly cease; and Elizabeth's friendly relations with King James are at once resumed.

trial, was found guilty of foreknowledge, art and part, of Darnley's murder, and was sentenced to death.

Before he was executed he made some important revelations to the ministers who attended him.[1] He stated that, after his return from his banishment for "Davie's slaughter," he met Bothwell at Whittingham, the residence of Archibald Douglas; that Bothwell proposed the King's murder; that he (Morton) said he was but new out of trouble, and unwilling to get into trouble again; that then Archibald Douglas, who was present, urged him to agree; that Bothwell also urged him, and said it was the Queen's mind; and that he (Morton) asked to see the Queen's "hand-write," which Bothwell never produced to him. He said also that Archibald Douglas afterwards came to him at St. Andrews from Bothwell, to show him that the murder was near a point, and to request his concurrence; but that he gave no answer, seeing he had not got "the Queen's hand-write." "Then being enquired whether he gave Mr. Archibald any command to be there? Morton answered, I never commanded him. Being enquired gif he gave him any counsel thereunto? he answered, I never counselled him to it. Being enquired gif he gave him any counsel in the contrair? he answered, I never counselled him in the contrair. After this, following forth the same discoorse, he said, 'Mr. Archibald after the deed was done shew to me that he was at the deed doing, and came to the Kirk of Field yeard

[1] Laing, ii. 323. 2d June 1581.

with the Earls Bothwell and Huntly.' Then being enquired if he received Mr. Archibald after the murder? he answered, I did indeed." He also acknowledged that he, with others of the nobility, subscribed a bond, that if any should lay the murder to Bothwell's charge they would assist him in the contrary. Last of all, it was said to him that, "in respect of his own deposition, his part would be suspected to be more foul nor he declared; he speired (asked) for what reason. It was answered, Ye being in authority, howbeit ye punished others for the murder, yet ye punished not Mr. Archibald, whom ye knew to be guilty thereof. He answered, I punished him not indeed, neither durst I." Morton died on the scaffold adhering to these statements.

It had always been a disputed point whether Darnley was killed by the explosion, or strangled and carried out before it; and one of the worthy ministers who attended Morton to the scaffold thought this an excellent opportunity to satisfy his curiosity. So, after solemnly adjuring Morton to speak the truth, as a man on the brink of eternity, he asked, "Was he worried or blawn in the air?" But Morton was not disposed to say more, and referred evasively to the depositions of those who had been examined about it.

Here, then, we have not the whole truth, but a very important fragment of the truth. And it is remarkable that the meeting of Morton and Bothwell at Archibald Douglas's house was known at the time to Elizabeth's ministers. It is mentioned in a letter by Drury to Cecil, with the addition that Lethington was

there.[1] Lethington was the man who six years before had predicted "wonderful tragedies" if the Queen came to Scotland.[2]—We have another fragment of the truth in a remarkable correspondence which took place between Morton and Lethington some years before Morton's conviction. Lethington, as well as Murray, had taken part with Morton in charging Mary with the murder; but Lethington repented and went over to the opposite side, upon which he was pursued and forfeited by his old friends for the murder, but kept out of their way. Lethington remonstrated against this proceeding being taken by Morton, "for a crime (he said) whereof he knoweth in his conscience I was *as innocent as himself.*" To which Morton replied, "that I know him innocent in my conscience as myself, the contrary thereof is true, for I was and am innocent thereof, but could not affirm the same of him, considering what I understand in that matter *of his own confession to myself of before.*"[3]

Queen Elizabeth's violence before Morton's trial and execution was not more remarkable than her sudden attitude of quiescence whenever his mouth was shut. Did he hold some terrible secret whose disclosure she feared?

Archibald Douglas kept himself safe in England till most of the witnesses died. Elizabeth held him for years in friendly confinement.[4] He sought and

[1] Drury, 23d January 1567 (Tytler, vii. 442).

[2] *Ante*, p. 16.

[3] Laing, ii. 329.

[4] The character of his confinement was very remarkable

betrayed the confidence of all parties. He tried to ingratiate himself even with the imprisoned Mary as well as the rest. She answered that she could have nothing to do with him unless he could satisfy her that he was innocent of her husband's murder ; and Archibald thereupon sent her a very remarkable letter, which, with stout denials of his own guilt, gives us some other and important fragments of the truth. He says that while in banishment in 1566 with Morton and his comrades, he was sent by them to Scotland to deal with Murray, Bothwell, Lethington, and others. He must have come secretly, for he was an outlaw, though in conference with the Queen's chief ministers. They informed him that they had joined in a bond against Darnley ; and that if Morton and his comrades would enter into the confederacy they would endeavour to procure their pardon. Mr. Archibald (that is the name by which he was uniformly spoken of) tells that he delivered this message faithfully to Morton and his accomplices at Newcastle, where they all agreed to enter into the bond. He returned at the time of the young Prince's baptism, and on reporting this the pardons were procured.[1] Morton then immediately came

During it, he continued the most intimate relations and correspondence with Elizabeth's highest and most trusted councillors.

[1] " With this deliberation, I returned to Stirling, when, at the request of the Most Christian King and the Queen's Majesty of England, by their ambassadors present, your Majesty's gracious pardon was granted to them all" (Archibald Douglas's letter to Queen Mary ; Robertson's Appendix).

Elizabeth herself wrote in the following year that Morton

to Whittingham, where Bothwell and Lethington joined him. Mr. Archibald tells that at Morton's desire he accompanied Bothwell and Lethington to Edinburgh, and was there instructed by them to tell Morton that "the Queen would hear no speech of the matter they had spoken of,"[1] and he says they would give him no farther explanation. He refers to Morton's confession, which had been published, yet he says not one word as to his own conversations with Morton about the murder, or his having told Morton that he was there when it was executed—but he adds for Mary's information, that the murder was done at the command of "such of the nobility as had subscribed band for that effect;" and then he concludes that although he knew all this, yet "it would not have been decent" in him to have accused the Earl of Morton, being so near of his kin.

The charge against Queen Mary came to rest mainly on the authenticity of letters said to have been written by her to Bothwell before her husband's murder as well as afterwards—and if Bothwell had truly been in possession of these letters, he could have had no diffi-

"was restored for gratifying us upon instance made by our order at the Earl of Bedford's being with the Queen" (Elizabeth to Throkmorton, 27th July 1567, printed in Keith, 428).

Morton, immediately on his return to Scotland, wrote to Cecil, expressing his gratitude to him for having instructed the Earl of Bedford to obtain his pardon and recall (10th January 1566-7, Morton to Cecil; State Paper Office).

[1] This seems to have been the occasion on which they attempted to get her to sign a warrant against Darnley.

culty in satisfying the demand which Morton says he made, to see "the Queen's hand write" on the matter. These statements also establish that within six weeks before Darnley's death a formidable confederacy had been organised against him, which included all the leading men in the Government (all the men in fact who, after Darnley's death, surrounded the widowed Queen), and combined with them, under a formal bond, the seventy-six conspirators who were pardoned at the young Prince's baptism.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THERE is a paper written by Murray, kept in the British Museum, in which he acknowledged that he had subscribed a bond with Bothwell, Huntly, and Argyle, in the month of October before Darnley's death. He said, "it was devised in sign of our reconciliation, in respect of the former grudges and displeasures that had been among us."[1] Abstract love and charity of course he represents as the motive for this bond—between him and Huntly, whose father he had hunted to death—between him and Bothwell, who had so often sought each other's lives. A bond could not be required unless there was to be some common action, and if there was to be common action, against whom was it to be directed? Who was the common enemy? Archibald Douglas says the bond which he was required by Murray, Bothwell, Argyle, and Lethington, to negotiate with Morton and his accomplices, was a bond directed against Darnley. Bothwell was in the same boat with Murray as to the Crown lands, and this community of interest may have helped to draw them together. But whatever the cause which brought them and Morton's party to unite in hostility to Darnley, their junction was plainly ominous to him. One man, the Laird of Ormiston, after he

[1] Goodall, ii. 322; Laing, ii. 315.

was condemned to be hanged as an accomplice in the murder, confessed, before his execution, that he was one of Bothwell's party at the deed; and that Bothwell showed him after the murder a bond, devised by Sir James Balfour, and subscribed a quarter of a year before the deed was done. He observed particularly the subscriptions of Huntly, Argyle, Lethington, and Balfour; and its terms, as he remembered, were "that the nobles thought it expedient that sic a young fool and proud tyran[1] should not rule over them, and that they had concluded that he should be put off by ane way or ither, and that whosoever should take the deed in hand they should defend and hold it done by themselves."[2]

Some of Bothwell's other servants were seized and executed for the murder. They died acknowledging their own guilt, and protesting the Queen's innocence. And they named their master, with Murray, Lethington, and Balfour as chiefs in compassing Darnley's death.[3]

[1] Laing, ii. 294.

[2] The phrase coincides singularly with Murray's description of Darnley to the Duke of Norfolk, "a young proud fool" (Leslie's *Negotiations* in Anderson's *Collections*, iii. 38).

[3] Archbishop of Glasgow to Cardinal of Lorraine, 6th February 1568:—"Envyrons les festes de Noel dernier douze ou quinze des principaux serviteurs, du Conte Badouel, furent pris prisonniers aux Isles des Orcades par Monsieur de St. Croix, l'un des freres bâtard de la Royne, qui pour le jourd'huy s'est faict Conte desdites Isles lesquels par tempeste de la mer furent contraincts y prendre terre, et apres menez a Lislebourg, et accusez de meurtre furent condamnez a mort, et toutefois executez en prison pour ce que quelques ungs d'eulx ayans demandé de grace

The precise mode of the King's death has always been disputed. Buchanan, who no doubt visited the scene of the murder and probably saw the body, and who was in a position to know as much of the truth as it was safe for the chiefs of the conspiracy to reveal, tells that Darnley was taken in a deep sleep, and strangled, with his servant, carried out to an adjoining garden, and the house blown up afterwards. He tells also that there were three bands of conspirators who came by different roads. Knox, who likewise had excellent opportunities of ascertaining the truth, records that many said the King was blown in the air, albeit he had no mark of fire; and then he adds, with a significance which shows he had sure information, wherever he got it, "he was strangled." Sir James Melville hints that this was accomplished by pressing a wet towel on his mouth till he died,—in short he was *burked;* and this accounts for the absence of marks on the body.

One of the three parties who went to the murder was Bothwell's. It is uncertain whether Bothwell was in the secret of Darnley being strangled before the explosion. His men certainly were not. They avowed that they had blown up the house, but declared that the

estre ouy par le Conte de Mouray confesserent bien avoir merite la mort, *declarant l'innocence de la Royne, et accusent les plus grands et principaux de son conseil* qui assistoient lois avec luy, *et mesmes le Conte de Morthon, et le secretaire Ledinton, et Balfour*, qui estoit Capitaine de Chateau de Lislebourg, et ledit Conte leur maistre en Dannemar" (Sloane Coll. 3199, pp. 158-60—British Museum).

King "was handled by no man's hands that they knew of." There was a conspiracy within the conspiracy. The truth seems to be that Bothwell's party had the clumsy part of the work assigned to them. And so clumsy was it, perhaps planned so intentionally, that the directors of the conspiracy could at any moment bring the murder home to Bothwell. Two horse-loads of powder were brought from Dunbar to Bothwell's lodgings, and on the night of the murder were carried on horses' backs through the streets to the Kirk of Field. The powder was then carried in by eight men, and deposited in the lower floor below the King's room. This must have been done while the Queen was with Darnley in his apartment up-stairs. Two men were left with the powder till all should be quiet above, and that there might be no mistake they were locked into the room with the powder. There they remained one hour, two hours, nearly three, and at last they were let out, and told to proceed with their work. They lighted a slow match, which they called a "lunt," remained at a safe distance till the house blew up, and then fled. This was all they knew, except that they saw three men in cloaks who were not of their party, and who kept their faces concealed, and wore slippers. One of these men at least had armour under his cloak. Bothwell was undisguised.

Who were the men in disguise? and where the other two bands of which Buchanan speaks?

Archibald Douglas' servants, Binning and another, were caught, tried, condemned, and executed for the

murder, a short time before Morton's conviction. They confessed that they went to the murder with their master ;· that he was in armour and had slippers on his feet.[1] Archibald himself, it will be remembered, reported to Morton that he was at the doing of the deed. He therefore was probably the disguised man in armour whom Bothwell's servants saw. He represented Morton's party.—Who were the others in disguise? That has never been ascertained with certainty. From Morton's confession we may infer that Huntly was one. Some circumstances indicate that Sir James Balfour was the third. The universal belief of the time pointed to him as an actor at the murder. Buchanan says without doubt he was one of the chiefs. Lord Hunsdon wrote[2] from Berwick to Randolph naming Balfour as one of the principal murderers, and there is in the British Museum a strange letter by Balfour to Cecil, boldly claiming his, and if necessary Elizabeth's own interposition, to protect him and his brothers from the peril of being tried for the murder, with a mysterious warning that any "inconveniences" which may arise are not to be imputed to him.[3]

[1] Buchanan, ii. 517.

[2] 3d February 1581 (State Papers, Scotland, vol. xxix. No. 24).

[3] Cotton MSS., Caligula, c. 4, f. 6, British Museum.

CHAPTER XIX.

Sir James Balfour and Archibald Douglas were men of such clerkly skill and mark that they were afterwards rewarded by Murray and Morton with seats on the Bench. Balfour is named by Knox "as blasphemous Balfour." He became Lord President of the Court of Session. His work on the practice of law was long a standard authority. At the time of the murder he was Lord Clerk-Register.[1] We may surmise that these men were deputed by the chiefs to regulate the action of the three distinct bodies of conspirators, so that each might do its assigned work while ignorant of the work, and perhaps even of the presence, of the others. Archibald and Balfour held the key of the conspiracy. Unknown themselves, knowing all, directing all, keeping in their hands the lives of all, perhaps preparing the evidence by which they could let vengeance loose on either of the active sections of the conspiracy at their will. Such a scheme might have been Morton's. Whether he was present

[1] Robert Melville's letter, 22d October 1566, quoted in Chalmers, ii. 467; Keith, 351. Melville's letter says—"Darnley was dissatisfied because he could not get the secretary (Maitland) the Justice-Clerk, and the Clerk-Register put out of their offices."

himself, or whether he was content to leave the business to his cousin and lieutenant, Archibald Douglas, it would not be easy to decide. Yet surely it is strange that lawyers should have been chosen. That could scarcely be for the mere butchery. Is there any purpose for which men of such skill could have been specially wanted ?

And now we touch a point which from that hour to this seems to have escaped discussion. What became of Darnley's papers ? Darnley had been made the focus of one terrible conspiracy. He held the bond which would have shown the participation in it of Murray and many more whose pardon had excepted that crime. He might possibly have held papers that would have compromised Randolph, or Randolph's employers. His position had long been such as must have encouraged desperate men to approach him. His papers, therefore, might be expected to make great revelations. If he had been simply strangled, these dangerous papers would have fallen into the hands of the Queen. If the house had been blown up at once, they would probably have been scattered broadcast over the streets of Edinburgh. But if Darnley and his servant were first strangled, Archibald and Balfour could ransack the papers, and, when they had made all safe, the explosion would hide all. And this helps us to understand also why the men in disguise were so strangely equipped with slippers.

Thus, then, we have (1) the *burking* party. Was it Hamilton's ? The house of the Hamiltons was close

to the King's house, and the archbishop who lived there, and was a Hamilton,[1] did not escape grave suspicion, and was put to death by Morton on that charge ; (2) the exploding party, which was certainly Bothwell's. We shall come to the third party by and by.

There is a notable gap in the documents at the State Paper Office of the time of Darnley's murder. For a month before, and almost a month after it, the reports of the English agents at Edinburgh have disappeared. These had hitherto been constant and copious, with the minutest information of everything that went on. The communications on this subject must have been numerous and important ; how much so we can judge from their graphic fulness of detail at the time of Riccio's death. They may have been taken out to form a special collection, and if so their discovery will some day tell the whole of this horrid tale in its naked and minutest particulars. But what if they touched some great personage ? Was it Mary ? If so, their loss would be accounted for by supposing that James on his succession sought to obliterate traces of her guilt. Yet if they had contained disclosures fatal to Mary, would Elizabeth have withheld them when she prompted and persuaded Murray and his comrades to charge her with the murder, as she un-

[1] " John Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, watched from the highest room adjoining the house till the explosion, then extinguished the lights and forbade his servants to go out" (Buchanan in Anderson's *Collections*, ii. 68).

doubtedly did, when Mary was her prisoner in England? Or during the long years when she wreaked her vengeance upon Mary, and at last persecuted her to death? It may be that Elizabeth, in some strange fit of returning affection for Mary, might have ordered these papers to be destroyed.—Or what if they touched herself? that would explain her frantic efforts for Morton, her attempt to stir up insurrection, her threats of war, her placing an army on the frontier to prevent justice being done upon him.

Yet, however carefully the State Papers have been weeded, one important letter on this subject had got among the Border correspondence, and remains. It is a letter from Drury at Berwick to Cecil:[1]—"The King was long of dying, and to his strength made debate for his life." "It was Captain Cullen's persuasion for more surety to have the King strangled, and not to trust to the train of powder alone, affirming that he had known many so saved. Sir Andrew Carr with others was on horseback, near unto the place, for aid to the cruel enterprize if need had been." What a revelation is this! Known to the English Court, concealed in Scotland[2] by Murray, Morton, and their com-

[1] 24th April 1567 (State Paper MS., Border correspondence; Strickland, v. 179).

[2] 17th June 1567. John Beaton's letter (Laing, ii. 115) says—"They tewk Capt. Culain that neight they entered the town quha has been ay sensyn in the Irnis [irons]." Tytler (vii. 203) says—"It was notorious that Cullen revealed the whole circumstances" (Drury to Cecil, 14th June 1567, B. C. Berwick; Scrope to Cecil, 16th June 1567, Carlisle, B. C.)

rades, kept from the world till that letter was found in recent times. Here, then, was the watching party of the conspirators—the third party spoken of by Buchanan. And who was Andrew Carr, the leader of this party? The villain who put his cocked pistol to Mary's breast on the night of Riccio's death—he whom she had specially excepted from pardon, even when she pardoned Morton and the rest—and Carr was still an outlaw—the last man in the world who would have served Mary, or who would have been employed in her work.

We know by the confession of some of the murderers that the original purpose was to have got Darnley out into the fields on some pretext, and to have slain him there; but that, two days before the murder, there was a change of plan, and it was determined to use gunpowder.[1] This change coincides so closely in date with the warning given by Murray's half-brother, the Lord Robert Stewart, to Darnley, and his denial of it when the Queen endeavoured to get at the truth, that there was probably some connection between the two things. Bothwell when he died named the Lord Robert, along with Murray, Morton, Lethington, and others, as in the conspiracy for the murder.[2] It is therefore not improbable that the Lord Robert gave this warning to Darnley to terrify him into flight, that he might be caught farther from the city; then we could understand why he denied the

[1] Hepburn's Declaration, 8th December 1567 (Laing, ii. 256).

[2] Laing, ii. 309.

warning when Mary set inquiries on foot. If there was a scheme of that kind, it helps us also to see the use of Carr and his horsemen.

What if this scheme was really pursued to the last? What if Archibald Douglas, the King's cousin, fearing that the servants in the neighbouring room might be roused by cries of murder, stole into the King's apartment while he was asleep, touched him, woke him, hushed him to silence, warned him that his murderers were at hand, that the house was mined and about to be blown up, and urged him to escape? There may have been ominous sounds to enforce the warning, and compel instant action. What if Darnley snatched up his clothes, threw his fur about him, and fled with Douglas, followed by his servant—and led into the arms of the assassins? In that case the assassins would be Douglases, and we get the meaning of the cry for "Mercy, my cousins!" If their work was well done, Archibald Douglas was but the man in the mask. If by any chance the King had escaped, Archibald Douglas had saved the King's life! In every event Archibald was secure—and Andrew Carr, with his horsemen, were ready.—This is conjecture. But it would reconcile most of the known facts, and it accords with all we know of Archibald and Morton, of Darnley's weakness, and of the scheme and scope of the conspiracy.

CHAPTER XX.

SURROUNDED as the Queen was before and after the murder, what chance had she to hear the truth—any truth that was dangerous to the conspirators? If they showed her the placards, she would there find herself charged with being an accomplice with Bothwell and others in the murder. Knowing that to be an outrageous slander on herself, she would naturally conclude that it was equally so on them. And if herself innocent, Bothwell was the very last of her lords whom she could suspect of having cause of quarrel with the King. He was almost the only man who had supported Darnley, and it is certain he was not of those to whom Darnley had demonstrated antipathy. The wild scheme of ambition which Bothwell afterwards pursued, had probably not clearly developed itself even in his own mind till after Darnley's death. Dreams he may have had. But the scheme which he finally executed seems to have been the growth of opportunity.

The Queen, after the murder, shut herself up in a dark chamber, and kept it till her physicians interposed for her health, and insisted on her going to Seaton. On 8th March, when Killigrew saw her, she was still in a dark chamber, and seemed in profound grief.[1] Two such

[1] MS. State Paper Office—Killigrew to Cecil, 8th March 1567. Printed by Chalmers, i. 209.

tragedies as had fallen on her household during the last twelvemonth, were enough to shatter the nerves of any woman. She had long lived in such an atmosphere of conspiracy, the few weeks before Darnley's death had been so full of alarming rumours, her warning from France was so significant, that she must have felt herself in a position of the greatest danger. We know by a letter which she wrote soon after, that she believed the catastrophe which cost Darnley his life had been intended for her also. On the night on which it occurred it was her first intention to have slept at the Kirk of Field, as she had done most of the previous week.[1] She was there till a late hour, and had left only on being reminded that it was the night of her servant's wedding. Her accidental absence, as she believed, saved her life. When she began to recover and reflect after the stunning effects of the blow, she received a new warning from her ambassador at Paris that some further plot was still to be executed against her.[2] No explanation was given, and she was bewildered. She knew that she must run her

[1] Chalmers, i. 206.

[2] The Archbishop of Glasgow, in writing to the Queen from Paris, 11th March 1567, said "that the Spanish ambassador, when he thanked him in the Queen's name for the warning he had given before the King's murder, though it unhappily arrived too late, replied, 'Suppose it came too late, yet apprise her Majesty that I am informed, by the same means as I was before, that *there is still some notable enterprise in hand against her, whereof I wish her to beware in time*'" (Sloane M.S. iii. 199; Strickland, v. 239).

own risk, but she determined to take precautions for the safety of her child, the heir of the crown. She placed him in charge of the Earl of Mar, and lodged him in the castle of Stirling.[1] If Bothwell had then had the control, would he have permitted this? When he came to power his first effort was to get the Prince into his hands,[2] but Mar justified Mary's judgment, and withstood him. He withstood Murray also, after he became Regent. He pledged himself to Mary, even while she was a prisoner, that he would keep his faith, and in this respect he kept it.

But it has been said, Why were not more energetic means used to detect the murderers? We remember how, in the year before, the arm of the law was paralysed by the contrivance of secret traitors, when the Queen was most urgent to have it executed against the murderers of Riccio. That murder was committed before the face of hundreds, yet not more than one man who planted his dagger in Riccio's body was ever brought to justice. The confederacy was more powerful now, for Bothwell and Huntly had joined it. Did Murray tell her that Bothwell was the murderer, and must be hanged? Far from it. A month after the murder he and Bothwell, as we find from letters in the State Paper Office, sat at the same convivial table with the English ambassador.[3]

[1] This was on 19th March (Birrel's Diary). "19th March 1567.—Prince sent to Stirling to the Earl of Mar in keeping" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*).

[2] Melville (Bann.), 179.

[3] 8th March 1567 (Chalmers ii. 347, *note*, and i. 209, where

But Darnley's father, the Earl of Lennox, wrote to the Queen, and charged Bothwell with the murder, saying that he did so on the strength of the anonymous placards. She instantly ordered Bothwell to trial. And they had to bring him to trial. Morton and Lethington stood beside him at his trial and supported him.[1] It was a collusive trial from beginning to end. But how could the Queen know that? The fact that he was acquitted would of course be reported to her. Possibly the legal evidence of his acquittal would be shown to her, but it is unreasonable to suppose that she could be informed of the details which they wished to conceal.

And what were Murray and all the rest of the Government occupied with in that time? Cecil, Murray's confidant at the English Court, who was as much behind the scenes as any man alive, wrote early in March[2] to Sir Henry Norreys, the English ambassador in France, that "Morton, Murray, and others, mean to be at Edinburgh very shortly, *as they pretend* to search out the malefactor." And Murray on the 13th day of

the letter is printed). It is a curious circumstance, and shows how little even a well-informed man foresaw the storm which was then so close at hand, that Killigrew, the ambassador of England, says in this letter, "I see no troubles at present, nor appearance thereof."

[1] Chalmers, i. 212, *note.*

[2] Chalmers, ii. 349, *note;* Cabala, 126. Elizabeth herself, in some of her moods, spoke of Murray and his friends as "rebels pretending reformation of religion" (Randolph to Cecil, 17th June 1566; Hayne, 449).

March[1] wrote two letters, one to Cecil begging a safe conduct in all convenient haste (he seems to have been providing a timely retreat in case of miscarriage), and another[2] to Throkmorton speaking of accidents proceeding from the bottom of wickedness, and announcing the determination of the party to "follow farther godly and gude purposes." It is almost the language he used when he set out for Edinburgh on the day before Riccio's murder.[3] That was what they professed to do. Let us see what they did. They and Bothwell, acting together in concert, within a fortnight after Darnley's death summoned Parliament. For what purpose? Conscious of their objects, Murray, Morton, and Lethington long afterwards represented it as a Parliament "set only for the reduction of the forfeiture of the Earl of Huntly."[4] But we know now from the Parliamentary Records, printed in modern times, that that was not the whole business, nor a tithe of the business. The great business of that Parliament, in bulk and in importance, was to ratify to Murray, Morton, Lethington, Bothwell, and others of the confederates, their vast grants of the Crown lands. And of all the acts which were passed for that purpose, there is none so voluminous, or so elaborately framed, by half, as the act which secured his earldom and lands to Murray. It was that confirmation of his estates which Knox had spoken of

[1] Murray to Cecil (State Papers, Scotland, xiii. 25).
[2] Chalmers, ii. 348, *note*.
[3] *Ante*, p. 55.
[4] Murray's Diary (Goodall, ii. 249); April 14, 1567.

so bitterly, as influencing Murray's conduct, years before.[1] Murray had succeeded in getting it at last.—Here then was a strange thing. The King had been murdered, under circumstances which were ringing through Europe. The Queen was prostrated with grief. Some of the murderers, as it turned out, were well known to them and acting with them, yet these great ministers of the Crown, instead of moving heaven and earth to bring them to justice, and discover the rest, set instantly about securing the Crown lands to themselves. Within seventy days after Darnley's death they had got the Parliament convened and over, and their titles ratified. Why such unseemly haste to profit by Darnley's death, instead of punishing its perpetrators? Darnley had been the chief hindrance to the ratification of these grants; and to Murray and Bothwell, above them all, the ratification was a matter of especial moment, for they were overwhelmed with debt.

Whether for that reason, or to be out of the way in case of discovery, or to concert further schemes with Cecil, and to secure the acquiescence of France, Murray proceeded to England and France a few days before the Parliament met. The act of ratification in his favour is so carefully prepared that it must have been in progress, if not ready, when he left. And that his absence was not expected to deprive him of authority is proved by a bond which he granted to Huntly just before he left, in which he bound himself to promote in that Parliament the reduction of Huntly's forfeiture.[2]

[1] *Ante*, p. 22.

[2] Laing, ii. 299, dated 8th April 1567.

These proceedings required a varnish, and so the confederates, Bothwell among the rest, joined in passing a short act annulling all laws and constitutions, civil, canon or municipal, "contrary to the religion" as it stood on the Queen's arrival from France.

Mary's slanderers have abused her as a most abandoned woman; and Murray after he grasped the office of Regent gave some countenance to that cry against her, to keep himself in power. But time reveals strange things. Murray's will has come to light. It is dated 2d April 1567, a few days before his departure to England and France. It appointed five executors, and it named Mary Queen of Scots "overish-woman[1] of my testament, to see all things handled and ruled for the weill of my dochter." This daughter was his only child. Is it credible that he placed the education and charge of his only daughter in the hands of a woman whom he believed to be what he afterwards represented her, an abandoned woman and a murderess? The truth is (as shall be shown afterwards), that the idea of charging the Queen with the murder was not adopted till they were in desperate straits, eight months later.

[1] Umpire.

CHAPTER XXI.

The Crown lands were ratified to their possessors on the 19th of April. On the same night the members of the Parliament were entertained by Bothwell, and after supper a bond was produced by Sir James Balfour, by which they bound themselves to sustain Bothwell's acquittal, recommended him as the fittest husband for the Queen, and engaged to support him with their whole power, and to hold as enemies any who should presume to hinder the marriage.[1] Every man of them signed, except the Earl of Eglinton, who "slipped away." There is some doubt whether Murray's name was attached to this bond. He was out of Scotland at the time it was produced, and on that ground it has been concluded that he did not sign it. On the other hand, there exists a memorandum by Cecil, taken by him from a clerk in the employment of Murray's secretary, who had the custody of the bond, in which Murray's signature is placed first. He may have signed it before he left Scotland. The unanimity and promptitude with which it was signed by the rest would be promoted by his signature.

Up to this time the conspirators had acted in perfect concert. The Crown lands were a bond of

[1] Keith (Spottis.), ii. 562.

union, and it seems to have been strong enough to hold them together till the close of the day on which a Parliamentary security was given to their title to these lands. The combination of interests which brought about these ratifications may have been purchased by some understanding with Bothwell that they were to protect him, and promote his suit to the Queen. But the price of their adhesion to Bothwell had now been paid, and their connection with him had been unnatural from the first. He had been their antagonist for many years, and it was not fifteen months since they sought his life. Circumstances soon arose which they seized as a release from their engagements to him.

Immediately after he had secured this bond for the marriage, Bothwell, according to a narrative written by Mary herself, began afar off to discover his intentions to her, and to assay "gif he micht by humil sute purches oure gude will, but fand oure answer nathing correspondent to his desyre."[1]

Two days after the bond was granted by the nobility to Bothwell, Mary proceeded from Edinburgh to Stirling to visit her child. Probably she wished, by leaving Edinburgh at this juncture, to indicate to Bothwell that her rejection of his approaches was decisive,—and he acted as if he thought so. His next step was that of a desperate man.

On her return from Stirling, three days later,[2] he suddenly met her at Foulbriggs with an armed force of from 700 to 1000 horsemen, seized her, made her

[1] Labanoff, ii. 37.

[2] 24th April 1567.

escort prisoners, and carried her off to his castle at Dunbar. He there kept her for eleven or twelve days. When she resisted his insolence, he produced the bond granted to him by the nobility, and she there found the signatures of every man from whom she could have expected help. Not one moved a finger in her defence. Huntly and Lethington, who were there with Bothwell, would not fail to remind her of the calamities which she had brought upon herself by opposing the policy of her nobles in her former marriage. Here was a match offered, and recommended by them all, under an engagement which almost implied rebellion if she did not comply, and it precisely answered the conditions which Murray had laid down for her former marriage,[1] and which so many had taken up arms to enforce, when she was much stronger in nerve and much more powerfully supported. Bothwell was native born. He was not her choice. He was shown by the bond to be the choice of her nobility. He was a Protestant, and she could not forget how he had commended himself to their favour by sternly resisting the mass. Day after day she held out, but no help came. Sir James Melville, who had been taken prisoner with her, records that such violence was at last used to her that she had no longer a choice. Bothwell, in his dying confession, said that he accomplished his purpose "by the use of sweet waters." Morton's proclamations charged him with using violence to the Queen, "and other more unleisum means."

[1] See *ante*, p. 33.

It seems not unlikely, therefore, that he employed some sweetened potion. She herself tells us that "in the end, when she saw no hope to be ridd of him, never man in Scotland ance making a mint for her deliverance, she was driven to the conclusion, from their hand writes and silence, that he had won them all." He partly extorted and partly obtained her consent to marriage.

Bothwell then conveyed the humbled and heart-broken Queen, surrounded by a great force, to the castle of Edinburgh. He next carried her before the judges, after lining the streets and crowding the court and passages with his armed retainers. She there submitted to make a declaration that she "forgave him of all hatred conceived by her for taking and imprisoning her;"[1] and also that she was now at liberty. The necessity for such a declaration implies previous coercion.[2] Morton and the others who had given their bond to Bothwell for the marriage, were so conscious of the pressure which they had put on the Queen, that on the 14th of May they obtained from her a promise, written below their bond, promising on the word of a princess "that she nor her successoris

[1] Anderson, vol. i. p. 87.

[2] By the ancient law of Scotland the guilt of rape was effaced by the woman's subsequent acquiescence, and it was not till 1612 (c. 4) that the effect of such acquiescence was limited to saving his life (Hume *On Crimes*, i. 306). The woman's declaration did not need to be on oath, but must be in freedom, and hence Bothwell required that the Queen should declare herself free.

sall never impute as cryme or offence to onie of the personis subscryveris thairof thaire consent and subscription to the matter above written thairin containit; nor that thai nor thair heires sall never be callit nor accusit thairfoir: nor yet sall the said consent or subscryving be onie derogation or spott to thair honor, or thai esteemit undewtifull subjects for doing thairof."[1]

A marriage was formally solemnised,[2] and so little was her will consulted that it was in the Protestant form. An old writer remarks, that "there was neither pleasure nor pastime at it."[3] Craig, the minister who proclaimed the banns, went like a bold and honest man to Bothwell, told him to his face that he objected to the marriage because he had forced the Queen, and when he could get no assurance from Bothwell that the marriage should be staid, he took the first oppor-

[1] Laban. ii. 22.

[2] The marriage was celebrated on 15th May 1567.

[3] "April 21, 1567.—Queen went to Stirling to visit Prince.

"24th.—Her seizure by Bothwell.

"29th.—Divorce intentit by Jean Gordon against Bothwell before Commissaries of Edinburgh.

"May 3.—Sentence of divorce.

"6th.—Queen, Bothwell, Huntly, Lethington, and all that Bothwell might, came from Dunbar. Artillery of Castle shot maist magnificently—raid to Castle, Bothwell leading Queen by bridle.

"8th.—Proclamation of marriage. James Balfour made captain of the Castle, and received the keys.

"15th.—Marriage, not with the mass, but with preaching. Neither pleasure nor pastime at it" (*Diurnal of Occurrents*).

tunity of denouncing it from the pulpit. Craig, with equal manliness, while Mary was a prisoner in Loch-leven, bore his public testimony in the next General Assembly, and no man contradicted him, that he stood almost alone in opposing the marriage, and that "the best part of the realm did approve it, either by flattery or by their silence."[1]

Du Croc wrote to Catherine de Medicis, three days after the marriage,[2] that on Thursday, the very day of the marriage, "her Majesty sent to ask me whether I had observed a strangeness of demeanour between her and her husband, which she begged me to excuse, saying that if I saw that she was melancholy it was because she could never wish to be happy again, desiring nothing but death. Yesterday (this was two days after the marriage), when closeted alone with Bothwell, she was heard to cry as loud as she could to give her a knife to kill herself. Those who were in the front room heard her. They thought that if God did not help her she would be driven to desperation. I have advised and consoled her as much as I could on the three occasions on which I have seen her. He will not be long her husband, he is too much hated in this kingdom."

Sir James Melville[3] relates that "the Queen was sa disdainfully handlet, and with sic reprocheful language, that Arthur Askin and I being present hard hir ask a

[1] Keith, old edition, p. 587.

[2] 18th May 1567. From the French in Tytler, vii. 456.

[3] Melville's *Memoirs* (Bannatyne edition), p. 180.

knyfe to stik herself, "or ellis," said sche, "I sall drown myself."[1]

That Bothwell had acted precipitately and from impulse on finding that the Queen was indisposed to admit his pretensions, is manifest from this, that when he carried her off to Dunbar his plans were so ill matured that marriage was impossible. The young wife whom he had wedded the year before was alive; and he had actually to get a process of divorce commenced after the Queen was his prisoner. The divorce[2] was begun and ended in a few days, before he brought the Queen from Dunbar.

It has been often asserted that his seizure of Mary was collusive. But any woman, to whom a choice was left, would have insisted, according to the old Scotch saying, on his being "off with the old love before he was on with the new." An ingenious theory was necessary, and was contrived by Lethington, to make her conduct even intelligible, on the supposition that she prearranged with Bothwell to carry her off

[1] Hume, who in general writes very unfavourably of Mary, says that during her imprisonment in England she recovered "by means of her misfortunes and her own natural good sense," from what he calls "that delirium into which she seems to have been thrown during her attachment to Bothwell," and "behaved with such modesty and judgment, and even dignity, that every one who approached her was charmed with her demeanour, and her friends were enabled on some plausible grounds to deny the reality of all those crimes which had been imputed to her."

[2] It was not begun before the 1st of May. See Duke of Norfolk's letter, Goodall, ii. 141, and Murray's answer, Goodall, ii. 144. See also Goodall, ii. 250.

with a show of force. The object was said to be that she might have an excuse for giving him a general pardon for treason, which would cover all crimes, and so protect him for the murder of the King.[1] It has been assumed by almost all who have written on the subject that such a pardon was granted. But a careful search of the records has disclosed no trace of it; and indeed it may be regarded as certain that it never existed, because, if it had, it would have barred the proceedings which subsequently took place for Bothwell's forfeiture, and evidence of its having been granted must also have been brought forward in the discussions which took place before Elizabeth, between Mary's commissioners and the Regent Murray.

[1] "Lethington told us there could be no device in lawe to pardon his foul fact of the murder, affirming that by the laws of that realme a pardon for great offences includeth all lesser facts and offences, but extendeth to none greater than that which is pardoned; and therefore, unless he should commit the highest offence, which is treason, as he did in laying violent hands upon his sovereigne, no pardon could serve to excuse him of the murder, and having his pardon for the treason it sufficeth also for the murder" (Norfolk's letter in Goodall, ii. 142).

CHAPTER XXII.

Now that Bothwell had leapt over the heads of his fellows, he began rapidly to draw the reins of power into his hands. He was hereditary Lord High Admiral of Scotland. The necessity of the Queen's service had made him also Commander-in-Chief. The principal fortresses of the kingdom were in the hands of his creatures. Stirling Castle was an exception; and it was the place to which Mary had sent her child for safety. Bothwell now demanded the custody of the Prince, and that demand was probably the cause of the terrible scene in which Mary threatened to seek relief in suicide.—He divided the Privy Council into four sections, which were to come in prescribed succession to attend to the public business, while he as the Queen's husband would preside at all their deliberations. It was now the middle of May; Morton's turn was not to come till the end of July, and was then to last for six weeks. Bothwell's aim was to secure himself in power, and he seems to have thought it necessary for that purpose to make himself absolute. Perhaps it was his only chance, but it precipitated his downfall.

He had never got over his quarrel with Elizabeth. She must soon have seen how little chance there would

be of her policy continuing to control Scotland, if he were permitted to make himself despotic, or even to preponderate in the government.

At this crisis, accordingly, a communication reached Morton from the English Court, couched, remarkably enough, in language almost identical with that which Elizabeth had used more than a year before, when she wished to exclude Bothwell from acting as the Scotch commissioner on Border disputes.[1] The communication to Morton was, that in England they could *by no means allow of Bothwell*, and it gave him to understand, in terms which were very intelligible to a hireling of England, that "such as before and after the murder were deemed to allow of Bothwell,"[2] were now expected to go on a different course. Mary's marriage to Bothwell had been completed on the 15th of May. This communication was dated the 23d. Whether it was wholly the cause or no, it is certain that from that time the confederates to a man abandoned Bothwell, and went on the opposite tack.

Sir James Balfour held the castle of Edinburgh. He had been deeply engaged in the conspiracy, and owed his appointment to Bothwell. Sir James Melville (the same who records the violence which compelled Mary's submission at Dunbar) tells also that he was himself employed at this time by Morton's party

[1] Letter of Queen Elizabeth to Randolph, 2d February 1565-6 (Lansdown MSS. viii.; Ellis' second series, ii. 303; Froude, viii. 234). "In no wise if we may choose can we allow of Bothwell."

[2] Robertson, Appendix No. 21, p. 257.

to corrupt Balfour.[1] He warned Balfour that unless he now joined against Bothwell he would be held guilty as art and part of the murder. And he tells us he succeeded. This is confirmed and explained by a very extraordinary bond entered into by Balfour, and remaining among the Morton papers, by which he promises to aid the conspirators with the castle of Edinburgh, and they bind themselves to take part with and defend him "in all his past actions," which from Melville's statement refers especially to the King's murder, and in fact implies almost an acknowledgment of it; and they bind themselves also to continue him in charge of the castle, and promote him in public office.[2] This transaction proved fatal to Mary. Melville adds that Balfour showed his distrust of the good faith of the other conspirators by stipulating that Kirkcaldy of Grange should promise to be his protector, "in case the nobility might alter upon him." Balfour's bond makes a farther stipulation that he was to have leave to fire a shot or two towards them when they should first come to Edinburgh. This was, as explained in the deed "to save his honer!"

Bothwell's papers were in the castle of Edinburgh, and when this bargain was made Balfour broke open a green desk in which they were, and found there, among others, the bond against Darnley which had been entered into

[1] Melville (Bannatyne Club), 179.

[2] Morton Papers, Bannatyne Misc. i. 18, § 16, "Mary."

among the conspirators.[1] They were now safe to denounce Bothwell. He had no longer the power even to expose them, and the castle of Edinburgh was won from him. He escaped with the Queen, and levied such force in her name as he could collect. Morton, Kirkcaldy, and others, also collected what force they could, and advanced on Borthwick castle, where Mary was. "Her majestie in mennis claithes, butit and spurit,[2] depairtit that samin neight from Borthwick to Dunbar."[3] The opposing parties met in arms on the 15th of June at Carberry Hill. The Queen had about 2000 men, of whom "the best part was commons."[3] On the other side there were 1800 horsemen and 400 footmen. "They were all gentlemen and weill in their gaire"[3] (well equipped). The Lords advanced "keeping the heighest and strainthest[4] places." Then a parley ensued. The Lords pledged themselves to give obedience to the Queen if she would quit Bothwell. She did so, and they permitted Bothwell to ride unpursued off the field. She persuaded him "to loup on horseback and ryd his way to Dunbar."[3] Morton

[1] "Sir James (Balfour) found in a green velvet desk, late the Earl of Bothwell's, and saw and had in his hands the principal band of the conspirators of that murder (Darnley's), and can best declare who were the authors and executors of the same" (Secretary Walsingham's letter, 3d February 1580, Cotton Lib. Calig. c. 6).

[2] In men's clothes, booted and spurred.

[3] John Beaton's letter, 17th June 1567 (Sloane Collection, 3199, 152, British Museum).

[4] Highest and strongest.

took the lead in these proceedings. He carried Mary to Edinburgh,[1] and confined her first in the Provost's house, and afterwards at the Abbey. While there, "scho cam yesterday to ane windo of hir chalmir that luikis on the Hiegate, and cryit furth on the peopil how scho was hadin in prison, and keept be hir awin subjects quha had betrayet hir. Scho cam to the said windo sundrie times in a miserable state, hir hair hingin about hir loggs" (ears).[2]

John Beaton, from whose graphic description this account is taken, was one of Mary's ordinary attendants, and saw what he describes. He adds: "They convoyit her down the gait (street), my Lord of Atholl on the ta syd of her, and my Lord of Mortoun on the other, with three or four hundreth men. There marchit afore her the space of ane hundreth paisses (paces) four score of hagbuttairs. There is on the anseing (ensign) that was borne agains her the day sho was taiken, and was borne yesterday amang the said hagbuttairs, ane mikill deth (big dead) man besyde ane grein tree, be the quhilk man they signifie the king, and on the other syde of the said trie, ane young barne, (young child), quhom be (by whom) they signifie my Lord Prince, fra quhais mouth their is written in gryt letteris 'JUIGE AND REVENGE MY CAUSE, O LORD.'"

[1] Morton's warrant against Mary bears that, "Her Ma^tie willingly rode in the company of her said nobilitie and faithful subjects fra Carberry Hill to Edinburgh" (British Museum, Sloane Collection, 3199).

[2] John Beaton's letter, 17th June 1567 (Sloane Collection, 3199, 152, British Museum).

Thus they conveyed her to Lochleven and shut her up there from June till May. In the end they compelled her by threats of death to sign a renunciation of the Crown, proclaimed her infant son King, and Murray Regent; and now at last the scheme of the conspiracy was fully accomplished. When this was done Murray returned from France, saw Mary in her prison, and, judging from the account of the interview given by himself to Throkmorton, used the most unmanly means to terrify her into continued submission. He left her for a whole night without hope of her life.[1] In the morning he pretended to relent, and worked upon her feelings to make her believe that she owed her life to his affection. She knew that she was under the lash of the terrible law of 1560 against the mass, and every day brought news from Edinburgh that her blood was demanded. The populace had been roused to the highest pitch of fury. "The women were the worst," though the men are said to have been mad enough. Pictures of the murder had been publicly exhibited—the young Prince on his knees praying vengeance for his father's blood—ballads accusing the Queen poured from the press. The preachers denounced her fiercely from the pulpit; everything was done to lash the people into madness. Morton, the chief murderer, directed all.

Bothwell lingered unmolested for nearly two

[1] "In conclusion, the Earl of Murray left her that night in hope of nothing but God's mercy" (Throkmorton to Queen Elizabeth, 20th August 1567; Keith, old ed., 444; Tytler, vii. 183).

months in Scotland; but the popular outcry at last compelled his quondam allies to send in earnest to take him. He then fled to Denmark, and was imprisoned there for the rest of his life.

The deed renouncing the Crown, which the successful conspirators forced the Queen to sign, is founded on a most audacious recital. It runs in Mary's name, and makes her say that "after lang and intolerable pains and labours for government of the realm, she had not only been vexed in her spirit, body, and senses, but also at length was altogether so wearied thereof, that her ability and strength could not endure it," and that "nothing could be more happy and comfortable to her in this earth" than to give up the Crown to her son, she "of her own free will" renounced it, and appointed her "dearest brother, James, Earl of Murray" to be Regent during the child's minority, and until he should be seventeen years of age.

Murray brought with him from the Continent assurances that their designs should meet with no resistance from France, and they were well assured of England. The first house which he entered in Scotland was Archibald Douglas's residence at Whittingham,[1] and the first persons with whom he was in consultation on his return were Archibald, Morton, and Lethington.[2] Bothwell alone was wanting of the party

[1] Tytler, vii. 181.

[2] The Bishop of Ross, who was intimately associated with Lord Herries, charged the murder home on Murray in these

which met there to concert Darnley's murder in the month before it was executed.[1] Murray assumed the remarkable words, which do not appear to have ever been contradicted :—

"Is it unknown, think ye, Erle of Murray, what the Lord Herries said to your face openly, even at your owin table, a few days after the murder was committed? Did he not charge you with the foreknowledge of the same murder? that you, riding in Fife, and coming with one of your most assured trusty servants, the said day wherein you departed from Edinburgh, said to him, among other talk—'This night, ere morning, the Lord Darnley shall lose his life'" (Anderson, i. Preface, p. 4; Tytler's *Enquiry*, ii. 91).

John Hepburn, domestic servant of the Earl of Bothwell, immediately before his sentence was executed for being concerned in the atrocious murder of the late Lord Darnley, confessed, in the presence of all the people, by whom the same was heard, the innocence of the Queen his sovereign lady, protesting it before God and his angels, whom he called upon to witness what he said, and praying that, if he lied, it might be to the eternal ruin and perdition of his soul. 'I declare,' said he, 'that Moray and Morton were the sole contrivers, movers, and counsellors of Bothwell in the commission of this murder; and that they have assisted in all the enterprises and conspiracies formed against Lord Darnley, and exhorted the Earl my master not to hesitate to execute boldly a deed so necessary for all the nobles of Scotland. I confess to have had knowledge of this, not only by word of mouth from my lord, "with whom they were associated in it, and who assured me they would bear him out in it," but by the letters and indentures signed by both of them, which he shewed me, and I have seen and read them myself, setting forth and describing the whole plot.' These were his last words, on the truth of which he perilled the salvation of his soul" (Innocens de la Royne d'Escosse, printed 1572; reprinted in Jebb's *Collections;* Strickland, vol. vi. 51).

[1] Throkmorton wrote in special confidence to Cecil—"Methinketh the Earl of Murray will run the course thet these men

government and kept it for the rest of his life; still receiving what he calls his "accustomed benevolence" —that is, his pay—from England.[1]

do, and be partaker of their fortune. I hear no man speak more bitterly against the tragedy and the players therein, *so little like he hath to horrible sins!*" (12th August 1567, Throkmorton to Cecil—State Paper Office).

[1] There is a curious recital of Murray's schemes down to Mary's escape from Lochleven in an old manuscript in the British Museum, supposed to be written by Archibald Douglas, and ending—

> "Finis, quoth Maister James Balfour,
> Quha sold ye Castle in ane ill hour."

Extracts from it will be found in the Appendix No. XVII.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Five months after Mary was imprisoned, Parliament was convoked for the middle of December in her infant's name. During all this time they had brought no charge against the Queen. Her imprisonment was held out to the world as merely seclusion from Bothwell.[1] They actually took two notaries to Lochleven after getting her demission signed, and went through the farce of protesting that she was not a prisoner! In all their proclamations and Council minutes during these five months they uniformly described her as Bothwell's victim, not as his confederate. But Mary and her friends protested that her resignation of the Crown had been compelled by force and was invalid. A Parliamentary inquiry into the truth would have been inconvenient and dangerous, and when Parliament approached, it became necessary that they should

[1] The warrant for her imprisonment in Lochleven, which was granted only by Morton, Athol, Glencairn, Graham, Sanquhar, and Mar, bears, "that after mature consultation, be common advice, it is thocht convenient, concludit, and decernit, that her majestie's person be sequestrat from all society of the said Erl Bothwell," and "ordains her to be convoyit to Lochleven, and to keep her Ma^{tie} surely, and not to send any intelligence to any levand person except by direction of the lords underscriband" (British Museum, Sloane Collection, 3199).

find some new pretext against her. The General Assembly published an address demanding that the cause of the Queen's detention should be explained, or that she should be set at liberty. The conspirators, now acting as a council of government, then resolved to charge her with the murder. But there was a great difficulty in the way. That double traitor Balfour still held the castle of Edinburgh, and kept his grip of the bond against Darnley. It was necessary to buy him a second time, but he stood out for an exorbitant price.[1]

[1] Throkmorton to Cecil, 26th August 1567 (State Paper Office, Tytler, vii. 193 ; *History of James VI.* p. 18).

Randolph wrote to Cecil—"To name such as are yet here living, most notoriously known to have been chief consenters to the King's death, *I mind not.* Only I will say that the universal bruit cometh upon three or four persons, which subscribed into a band, promising to concur and assist each other in doing the same. This band was kept in the castle, in a little coffer or desk covered with green, and after the apprehension of the Scottish Queen at Carberry Hill was taken out of the place where it lay by the Laird of Liddington, in presence of Mr. James Balfour, then Clerk of the Register and keeper of the keys where the registers are" (15th October 1570, M.S. State Paper Office ; Tytler, vii. 346). Randolph asseverates that Murray was not one of the subscribers.

Sir Fras. Walsingham, before Morton's trial, wrote (3d Feb. 1580) that Balfour was to be produced as a witness against Morton. He says—"Sir James Balford has been called into Scotland. . . . The said Sir James Balford found in a green velvet desk, late the Earl of Bothwell's, and saw and had in his hands, the principal band of the conspirators in that murder, and can best declare and witness who were authors and executors of the same" (Cotton Library, Caligula 6, British Museum).

A very critical date also approached for the holders of the Crown lands. On the 8th of December Mary Stuart would complete her twenty-fifth year. Her power to revoke their grants would expire by law on that day. She conceived that the Parliamentary sanction which they had obtained removed only the statutory nullity which attached to Crown grants made without consent of Parliament,[1] and that she still had her private right of revocation on the ground of minority. It appears accordingly that before that date she executed a secret revocation at Lochleven.[2] The royal power to revoke grants made in minority was then considered very large. It had been exercised in the most sweeping manner by Mary's predecessors, and was so exercised by her successors. The holders of these lands could not long be kept ignorant of this alarming act of their prisoner. Her friends, indeed, would be likely to boast of it as soon as it was successfully executed; and uneasy consciences would suggest

[1] See *ante*, p. 34.

[2] Statement of her Commissioners (Good. ii. 214 and 211). Scrope and Knollys wrote of Mary, on her first reaching England, to Elizabeth, 29th May 1568:—"She fell into discourses that the cause of the warre and disobedient treason of the cheefe of these hyr subjects was thereby to keep that which she had so lyberally gyven to them, by violence; since, throe hyr revocation thereof within full age, they cowld not injoye the same by lawe. And withall she affyrmed that both Lyddington and the Lord Morton were assenting to the murder of her husband, as it could well be proved, althoe nowe they would seme to persequute the same" (Goodall, ii. 71).

doubts whether after all they had finally secured their ill-got possessions. To go before Parliament in these circumstances, resting alone on Mary's compulsory resignation of the Crown, would be a step of questionable prudence. So they submitted to Balfour's terms. Murray conveyed to him the Priory of Pittenweem (a slice from the lands of his earldom), paid him £5000, gave him a remission for the King's murder, and a pension to his son. Balfour then gave up the castle, and we know from a letter of one of the English ministers that Lethington burnt the bond for the King's murder. That letter from Drury to Cecil is dated 28th November. "The writings," he says, "which did comprehend the names and consents of the chief for the murdering of the King is turned into ashes."[1] And within a week after the date of that letter the Regent Murray and his confederates joined in a minute of Council[2] agreeing to charge Mary with the murder of her husband, and with having preconcerted with Bothwell her being seized and carried to Dunbar. This was on 4th December, four days before Mary's twenty-fifth birthday, and within eleven of the meeting of Parliament. That minute bears the signatures of Murray first, next Morton, and a little below them Sir James Balfour and Maitland of Lethington.

[1] Drury to Cecil, 28th November 1567 (Tytler, vii. 204; *Quarterly*, lxvii. 334). See also Randolph to Cecil, 15th October 1570, quoted in Tytler, vii. 346 (State Papers, vol. xix. 61).

[2] 4th December 1567. This minute is printed in full by Goodall, ii. 62.

But before this was accomplished, they had issued and executed their summons of treason against Bothwell, in which they had charged him with the murder, with no imputation against the Queen, and with treason, by seizing and forcing[1] the Queen; and there was not time to alter it before the meeting of Parliament, for Bothwell, being then out of Scotland, had by law to be summoned on forty days' notice. His estates, when forfeited, were to be divided among them; and therefore they did not omit any of the legal forms of forfeiture.[2] Thus it has come that there are two incongruous Acts in that Parliament—one forfeiting Bothwell for treasonable violence to the Queen, and another asserting that "all was done in her ain default;" one pronouncing her a murderess without permitting her to be heard, another describing her as the "Prince's dearest mother." This was probably never known to Mary, who was in prison at the time; and it seems hitherto to have escaped notice.

Lethington long afterwards acknowledged that

[1] The violence used by Bothwell to the Queen is characterised in the summons as "vis aut metus qui cadit in constantem virum,"—such force and fear as would shake a man of firmness and resolution. It is the law phrase for such violence as would annul a deed.

[2] There is a curious illustration of their anxiety on this point. It was then considered necessary that, to secure the lands, the decree of forfeiture should be proclaimed at the place where the Sovereign's court was held for the time. And to make all sure, they caused Bothwell's forfeiture to be proclaimed, not only where the infant King was, but also at Lochleven, where they kept the deposed Queen iu custody.

after they put the Queen into Lochleven the country did not join them as they hoped—"never ane came more to us than we were at Carberry Hill"—he declared they were at their wits' end, and contrived the setting up of the young Prince as King "just as a fetch to get them out of the scrape,"[1] without any confidence that it was to last. He said it was "as if you were in a boat on fire—you would loup[2] into the sea, and then when you were like to drown, you would be glad to get back into the boat."

[1] Dalzell's *Illustrations of Scottish History*, p. 159. [2] Leap.

CHAPTER XXIV.

When they resolved to charge the Queen with the murder, Morton brought forward a parcel of papers, stating that Bothwell kept them in a silver casket in the Castle of Edinburgh; that Balfour had sent it to Bothwell after Mary's surrender at Carberry Hill; and that he (Morton) had intercepted it in the hands of a servant, Dalgleish, who was since dead.[1]

[1] "Quhilk box and haill pecis within the samyn wer takin and fund with umquhile (the deceased) George Dalgleische, servand to the said Erll Bothvile, upon the *20th day of June* ye yeir of God 1567 yeirs." (The Regent Murray's receipt to Morton for the box and letters, 16th September 1568, printed by Goodall, ii. 90; and Morton's receipt for them in the same words, 22d January 1570-1—Goodall, ii. 91).

It is remarkable that within a week after the 20th of June, when these letters are represented as having been seized, there is a minute in the records of the Privy Council which proves that at that time they were regarded not as evidence against the Queen, but as proving that she was Bothwell's victim. This minute is inedited, and is in these terms:—"Edinburgh, 26 June 1567.—The Lords has, by evident proof as weill of witness as *writings* made manifest unto them that James Erl Bothwell was the principal deviser of the murder, and at the actual doing thereof himself; whairthrow the said Lords has pursued him, and yet intends to pursue him, and all his complices, adherents, and partakers, with all extremitie for the same; *as also for the reveissing of our Sovereyn's person* and maist unlawful joining of himself with her Majesty in pretendit marriage, against the

This was represented to have happened after Balfour had betrayed Bothwell, and knew him to be ruined.[1] From what we have seen of Balfour we may judge whether, if he had got hold of papers that really proved the Queen guilty of the murder, he would have parted with them so simply as Morton said. These papers were afterwards produced by Murray and Morton before Queen Elizabeth. Mary, then Elizabeth's prisoner, claimed to see them and to have copies of them, but this was not allowed.

"They [her commissioners] desirit the writings producit be hir unobedient subjectis, or at the leist the copies thairof, to be deliverit unto thame, that thair Maistres might fullie answer thairto, as was desyrit.

"And the Quenes Majestie of Ingland tuik to be advysit thairwith."[2] She afterwards said she would not refuse the *doubles*,[3] if Mary would sign a paper acknowledging Elizabeth's jurisdiction over her! which she knew Mary was certain to refuse, as she

law of God and the law of the realme" (Original Minutes of Privy Council). Their Council minutes of 9th and 21st July bear "that the said Erl continuand in his mischief and wickedness, first treasonably reveist hir Majestie's maist nobill person, and then constrainit her, being in his bondage and thraldom, to contract sic a pretendit and unlawful marriage with him, &c. * * * and the danger to the son, seeing the murderer of his father aspirit to that roume" (place).

[1] Hume says that according to Morton's account, Balfour gave notice to Morton of his having sent the casket to Bothwell in order that it might be intercepted. This makes the story still more improbable.

[2] Goodall, ii. 297; 7th Jan. 1568. [3] Goodall, ii. 310.

had always done. Indeed, when Elizabeth's commission opened, the first step taken by Mary's commissioners had been to protest solemnly 'that the Queen's Majestie thair Sovereigne should nawayis recognize herself to be subject to ony judge on eird [earth], in respect she is ane fre Princes, having imperial crowne given her of God, and acknowledges no uther superior."[1] And Elizabeth's commissioners had protested, in reply, that Elizabeth had jurisdiction as a right "incident to the crowne of England, which the Quene's Majestie and all her noble progenitors, kingis of this realme, have claymed and enjoyed as superiors over the realm of Scotland."[2] It was a vain attempt to revive the old claim of the Edwards, which after many bloody wars had been slain and buried by the Bruce at Bannockburn; and Mary could not have yielded it without betraying her country. Elizabeth knew this well. And the condition without which she would not let Mary see even copies of these papers, shows how hard she was put to it to evade the demand that they should be exhibited.

Morton subsequently got the original writings back into his own hands,[3] and they all, with perhaps one exception, ultimately disappeared. These papers are in truth the only tangible evidence against the Queen, and they came from a most suspicious source. Their disappearance is also a suspicious circumstance; and we approach their examination under the great disad-

[1] Protestation, 7th Oct. 1568, Goodall, ii. 124. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] 22d Jan. 1570-1, Goodall, ii. 91.

vantage of being deprived of the originals. They have always been challenged as tainted with forgery ;[1] and many of the checks against forgery depend on examination of the original writings.

The first of these papers was produced as a promise of marriage by Mary to Bothwell, given before the death of her husband.[2] It has no date, and the pretext that it was granted before Darnley's death is thoroughly disproved by the circumstance that it contains the words "since God has taken my late husband Henry Stuart called Darnley." It is amazing that the document should have been put forward with a statement which its own words so effectually disprove. The name too which this paper gives to her late husband is suspicious. Darnley was the title which he had before she made him first a duke and then

[1] The Bishop of Ross wrote to Queen Elizabeth in Mary's defence, 6th December 1568. He said, as to the letters, that his mistress challenged them as forgeries, and that "there are sundry who can counterfeit her handwriting who have been brought up in her company, of whom there are some assisting them." * * This was Lethington's wife, who was educated in France along with Mary, and was taught writing by the same master. He proceeds—"And it may be well presumed that they who have put hands to their prince, imprisoned her person, and committed such heinous crimes, if a counterfeit letter be sufficient to serve them, maintain their cause, and conquest to them a kingdom, or at least the supreme government and authority thereof for a long space, will not leave the same unforged." (Goodall, ii. 380, 389).

[2] "Upon credible grounds, supposed to have been maid and written be hir before the death of hir husband" (Buchanan's *Detection*—Goodall, ii. 54).

king. He was called Darnley only by those who wished to show disrespect, or to question her right to give him the title of king. It touched her prerogative, which it had cost her a rebellion to maintain.[1] Therefore if she ever wrote this paper, it must have been under constraint, and probably while she was Bothwell's prisoner at Dunbar.[2]

Morton produced another contract of marriage, professing to be dated at Seaton on the 5th of April ;—but the date is clearly falsified, for the contract sets forth that "a process of divorce has been intented" between Bothwell and Dame Jane Gordon his first wife, and it repeats a second time that that process has been "already begun." But we know for certain that that process

[1] Even in her will, when she left him such a touching remembrance of her affection, she was careful to assert his title as king. See *ante*, p. 89.

[2] The author has found at the British Museum (Cotton Library) a document which may be the original of this paper. It is in a lawyer's handwriting, and has attached to it a subscription resembling Mary's. There is a considerable blank between the writing and the signature, giving the impression that either the signature was there before the writing was inserted, or a blank left as for a testing clause in the Scotch form. There are no witnesses to it, and therefore the testing clause could not be filled up. On careful comparison with her ordinary subscription, the name looks much liker an imitation than a genuine signature. This MS. is in Caligula, O. I. 121, p. 206. It is pasted on the back of a "Reply and true declaration by the Queene of Scots' Commissioners, 16th October 1568," which bears the original signatures of the Bishop of Ross and other Commissioners—an original document, which passed through Cecil's hands.

was not begun till after Mary was Bothwell's prisoner.[1] In fact, these writings, if otherwise genuine, just indicate the successive stages of coercion used at Dunbar by Bothwell against the Queen. The first, of a few lines without date or witness; the second, a long formal deed signed before two witnesses—George Earl of Huntly, who we know was one of the party at Dunbar, and Thomas Hepburn, parson of Aldhamstocks, Bothwell's parish at Dunbar, a worthy whom, as soon as the marriage was solemnised, Bothwell made a Privy Councillor.—But what would be the use of falsifying the date of this contract? Obviously to make it appear that she had agreed to marry Bothwell before he carried her off, and that instead of her being intimidated or influenced by the bond of Morton and his confederates to Bothwell for the marriage, they might be able to pretend that they were led to sign that bond by the knowledge that she had previously signed a contract of marriage.

Morton also produced a third contract of marriage, still more formal, dated the 14th of May, the day before the marriage was solemnised.

What was the use of so many contracts of mar-

[1] "The said Erle plainlie enterprisit to ravish her person and leid hir to Dunbar castell, haldin her their as captive a certaine space during quhilk he caused divorce be led betwixt him and his lawful wife" (Answer of James Erle of Murray, Regent, and remanent Commissioners—Goodall, ii. 144). The Duke of Norfolk's report to Elizabeth states positively that the divorce was not begun before the 1st of May, and yet with speed ended within eight days (Goodall, ii. 141).

riage, each more formal than its predecessor, unless Bothwell feared that the Queen might slip through his fingers?

There were some letters produced by Morton, which if they truly were written by Mary to Bothwell, would be conclusive of her guilt. And Mr. Froude, who is one of the most painstaking and able writers of history at present alive, has only last year published a most interesting history of those times, in which he assumes the authenticity of these letters, and actually interweaves them with his narrative as historical documents.

When Mary heard of them, she specially instructed her commissioners in the following remarkable words: "Gif ony sic writings be, they are false and feigned, forged and invented by themselves, and ye shall desire the principals to be produced, and that I myself may have inspection thereof and make answer thereto."[1] But neither she nor her commissioners were allowed to see them.

While she was a prisoner in England, Elizabeth secretly pressed the Regent Murray to bring forward before her judges the charge of murder. He was very shy about it.[2] He showed even greater timidity about the production of the letters; and before he would give an answer to Elizabeth's entreaties, he actually

[1] Goodall, ii. 342.

[2] Elizabeth threatened to invest the Duke of Chatelherault with the Regency if Murray refused to pursue the accusation (Mignet, ii. 40; Tytler, vi. 67).

tried to make a bargain as to the judgment to be given. We have his very words :[1] "It may be that sic letteris as we haif of the Queene our Soveraine Lordis moder, that sufficientlie in our opinioun preivis her consenting to the murthure of the king hir lauchful husband, sal be callit in doubt be the juges to be constitute for examination and trial of the caus, quhether thay may stand or fall; pruif or not. Thairfor sen our servand Mr. Jhone Wode hes the copies of the samin letteris translated in our language, we wald ernestlie desyre that the saidis *copies* may be considerit be the juges that sall haif the examinatioun and commissioun of the matter, that they may resolve us this far, *in cais the principal agree with the copie, that then we pruif the caus indeed:* For quhen we haif manifestit and schawin all, and zit sall haif na assurance that it we send sall satisfie for probatioun, for quhat purpois sall we ather accuse, or tak care how to pruif, quhen we are not assurit quhat to pruif, or when we have preivit, quhat sall succeed." Is that a proposal which could be made by honest men, who believed that they had honest writings to show, and honest judges to inspect them? Clearly Morton and Murray wished the judges to do exactly what Mr. Froude has done—assume that the writings were authentic, and on that assumption hold the cause "proved indeed."

These letters, in truth, were as gross and clumsy fabrications as ever were put forward. This has been well proved by Whitaker, Goodall, and the elder

[1] Goodall, ii. 75.

Tytler, whose criticisms upon them have never met with any sufficient answer,[1] and therefore only a few points may be noticed which these able writers have not touched, but which of themselves would be decisive.

One of the letters is described by Elizabeth's commissioners as "a horrible and long letter, of her own hand as they say."[2] And certainly it is long, and contains very horrible things. We have now seven volumes, published by Count Labanoff, of Mary's real correspondence, and any one who has looked into that correspondence, and made himself acquainted with its spirit and character, must acknowledge that it is imbued everywhere with the noblest feeling, the finest language, the purest thought; pity and mercy in almost every page. But there are passages in the letters produced by Morton which are loathsome and horrible to the last degree, such as the vilest of her sex would hardly utter or write. The long letter referred to is exhibited as a love letter by her to Bothwell, and it occupies fourteen quarto pages of print![3] It is a very strange document. Four-fifths of it consist of a cool and business-like recital of circumstances such as it would have been very proper for Mary to state in a memorial for the information of her Privy Council or confidential advisers, and that was probably

[1] Dr. Johnson said, on considering them, "that the silver casket letters were spurious, and would never again be brought forward as historic evidences."

[2] Goodall, ii. 142. [3] Anderson's Collections, ii. 131.

the true character of the document originally. It is actually spoken of in the body of the paper as "the memorial."—Her relation with Darnley had ceased to be a mere domestic question. It had become an affair of state, which had engaged the deliberations of the Privy Council, and they had three months before transmitted to the Queen-Mother of France an official statement on the subject. It was therefore necessary that the reconciliation should be fully explained to them.—But while this is the general character of the paper, there are at the commencement, towards the middle, and at the end, passages of the most extravagant love-making, and palpable suggestions of murder; passages so different in style, language, and thought from the rest of the paper, that one cannot understand how they could have proceeded from the same mind, or how the hot and the cold should have been intended for one person. It seems as if the blanks at the beginning and end had been filled up with forged passages, and false sheets inserted at the middle;[1] and to gloss over any difference in the handwriting or appearance of the interpolations, she, the most accomplished lady of her time, is made at the end of the paper to say—"*Excusez mon ignorance à escrire,*" and then with apologies for scantiness of paper, "*excusez la briefueté*

[1] This was the view taken of these papers by the Lords and Bishops who supported Mary's cause while she was in England, some of whom had seen the papers in Parliament. "The samin is devysit be thameselfis *in sum principal and substantious clauses*" (Instructions by the Earls, Lords, and Bishops, 12th Sept. 1568, printed in Goodall, ii. 361).

des characteres," apparently intended by the falsifiers to account for some suspicious appearances of cramming in the manuscript; "that thing that is scriblit," they have made it in Scotch. Hence, no doubt, the care taken that Mary and her friends should never see the originals.

To take a sample passage—very far from the worst: one of the forged passages represents Mary, a married woman, writing to Bothwell, a married man, and suggesting contrivances by which they were to be freed and united. The passage is—"We are coupled wi' twa false races, the devil sinder us"—that is, rid Mary of her husband, and divorce Bothwell from his wife (for that is the scheme which was imputed to her),—"and God knit us together for ever"—that is, Mary and Bothwell—"for the maist faithful couple that ever he united. This is my faith, and I will die in it."[1] And this, we are to believe, was written by Mary Stuart. The process was to be to divorce Bothwell from his wife, which, in the eye of a Catholic, could be done only through the action of the church. The thought which underlies the phrase "devil sinder us," in its application to Bothwell, consequently identifies the Romish Church with the congregation of Satan, a conception which could never have entered the mind of a Catholic. Mary could not have written it without horror. It is obviously the thought of an ultra-Protestant—such a Protestant as Morton was.

Mary's memorial consisted of two parts, and each part closed, as such memorials sometimes do, with an

[1] This is from Murray's Scotch translation.

abstract of its contents. Did anybody ever hear of a love-letter of that kind? And the forgeries are so clumsy, and the interpolation so manifest, that the forged passages are not included in the abstracts, and one of the abstracts contains a head which has no corresponding place in the body of the paper, a portion being thus indicated which seems to have been taken out and its place occupied by forged passages. The second abstract runs, "Remember you of the Earl of Argyle" (that passage remains in the body of the paper), "of the Earl of Bothwell" (and that is the missing passage), "of the lodging in Edinburgh" (and that passage remains). And why was the passage as to the Earl of Bothwell taken out? Obviously because it would have made it impossible to represent the paper as a letter addressed to Bothwell; and, as is very common with falsifiers, they overlooked the circumstance that Bothwell's name, as it remains in the abstract, is just as conclusive as the missing passage could have been that the paper, whatever its history, could not have been addressed to Bothwell, for what would have been the use of telling Bothwell to remember himself? It has been suggested indeed that these abstracts are memoranda by Mary of the subjects upon which she intended to write; but how ridiculous is it to suppose that in writing a love-letter of such inordinate length to a man with whom she is charged with being madly in love, she required to put down a note on paper, that she was to remember the person she was writing to!

This letter or memorial, as produced by the confederates, was wholly in French, which was the language chiefly used by Mary. Goodall and the elder Tytler proved, by a critical examination of various parts of it, that the French was not the original, but a translation; that it had been translated from Buchanan's Latin; and that Buchanan's Latin was itself a translation from Murray's Scotch version.

The proof of this was so overwhelming in regard to the bulk of the letter, that Robertson and Hume, who took the opposite side, did not attempt to confute it. They took refuge in the supposition that there may have been some fourth version in French from which the Scotch was translated! and that that lost version was the true one which the Queen wrote. On this remote conjecture, which Mr. Froude follows, they founded their case against her.

But they also referred to other passages in the letter (and they were right) in which the idioms and construction are so purely French, and the Scotch version so inferior, as to make it almost equally certain that the French of these is the original, and the Scotch a translation.

The controversy was so hot, and became so personal, that both parties fought for victory: one maintaining that the paper was wholly spurious, the other that it was wholly genuine. But the natural deduction from the facts on which they seemed at last to agree is, as the author thinks, that the paper was interpolated. And it was in the innocent passages

that Hume and Robertson found their examples, while Goodall's, proving it spurious, were taken from those which infer guilt.

It would be tedious to go far into these controversies. One amusing instance is given by Goodall. The Scotch version makes the Queen say, "I am *irkit* (weary) and going to sleep." Buchanan, who was getting old, had mistaken the two first letters of *irkit*, and read it "nakit;" so he solemnly translates "*Ego nudata sum;*" and the French translator, following suit and improving on it, makes it "*toute nuë*" (stark naked)—a strange condition for her Majesty while writing so long a letter in a northern January!

Here is an example which appears to have escaped even Goodall. The Scotch version makes the Queen speak of the Gordon[1] *family* as a "false race." Buchanan translated it "gens illa perfida," and the Frenchman expanded it into "nation infidele!"—The paper, apologising for its own length, spoke of it as "*so lang;*" the Frenchman mistook it for length of *time*, and made it "par ce qu'il *dure* tant!"—On the same subject it said, "I shall end my *lybil*"[2]—an old Scotch word still in use, derived from and having the same meaning as the Latin *libellus*, or little

[1] Jean Gordon, Bothwell's wife, was the person pointed to by this interpolation.

[2] The word seems to have puzzled the commentators of last century from the last letter being printed *b*. They guessed that it should have been "bill," for a note or letter.

book.[1] Buchanan unluckily mistook the first letter for a *b*, and translated it "*mea biblia;*" the Frenchman followed, "*ma bible!*"[2]

To convey the idea that she had a disgust for Darnley's person, she was made to speak of the foulness of his breath—so foul that she could come no nearer than a chair at the bed-foot, he being at the other end of the bed—Buchanan translated it of Darnley's feet instead of the bed's, and rolled out in majestic Latin, "sed in cathedra sedeo ad pedes *ejus* cum ipse in remotissima lecti parte sit," which is not very remote from nonsense; but the French assistant could do no more than follow,—"Mais je m'assieds en une chaire â *ses* pieds, luy estant en la partie du lict plus esloignée."

The high tone of Mary's mind may be inferred from her writings. We here give a translation of two stanzas from

[1] The English word libel has the same root, but is by usage limited to defamatory writings.

[2] The passage given *ante* on p. 172, from Murray's Scotch version, runs thus in the French:—

"Nous sommes conjoints avec deux especes d'hommes infideles: le diable nous vueille separer, et que Dieu nous conjoingne á jamais, à ce que soyons deux personnes tres fideles, si jamais autre ont esté conjointes ensemble—voila ma foy, et veux mourir en icelle."

Here the spirit and terseness of the Scotch are poorly rendered. There seems little doubt the original of it was drafted in Scotch and manufactured into French, for engrafting on Mary's French memorial.

HER WAIL FOR THE DEAD.

"All that was pleasant to my eyes
Now gives me pain;
The brightest day is dark to me;
I have no heed
For the most exquisite delights.

"If I look up to Heaven,
I see his gentle eyes
Gazing on me from the clouds;
If I look on the waters
I see him as in his grave."

Contrast with these, or any of her undoubted writings, the coarseness of thought and language imputed to her by the forgers, in their interpolations :—

"Cursed might this pockish man be that causes me so much pain." "He has almost slain me with his breath." "The devil sunder us." "I am not well at ease, and yet very glad to write to you while the rest are sleeping, since I cannot sleep as they do, and as I would desire; that is, in your arms, my dear love."

How rank it is!

CHAPTER XXV.

Along with the other forged papers Morton produced against the Queen a number of French sonnets, which he said she had written to Bothwell, and he had intercepted in the casket. There were two eminent Frenchmen alive at that time—Brantome the historian, and Ronsard the poet—who were intimately acquainted with and admired Mary's compositions. They both pronounced these sonnets spurious; and Brantome writes of them that they are too coarse in conception, and too rude in execution, to have proceeded from her.[1]

Morton further produced several French letters by Mary, which he said he had found in Bothwell's casket, and in three of these the author detects no marks of forgery. One of them is that beautiful letter which has already been quoted as written by her to Darnley, which

[1] The following specimen of another true sonnet by Mary is from a translation published by Miss Strickland (vi. 231):—

SONET PAR LA ROYNE D'ESCOSSE.

L'Ire de Dieu par le sang n'est appaise.

The wrath of God the blood will not appease
Of bulls and goats upon his altar shed,
Nor clouds of fragrant incense upward spread:
He joyeth not in sacrifice like these.

the internal evidence shows that it was ;[1] but the villain Morton produced it as a letter by her to Bothwell, and so converted all her expressions of wifely affection into loathsome longings for a paramour. Every incident which appears in that letter precisely agrees with facts which we know in regard to Mary and her husband ; but not one incident or allusion which it contains is suitable to Bothwell. There is one phrase in it which is almost conclusive, where, speaking of the relation between her and the person to whom it is addressed, she refers to herself as she "to whom alone you rightfully belong," "and who alone has won you loyally ;" and again, she refers in it to "all the evils which you have caused to me," which is very descriptive of Darnley, but had not been true (quite the reverse) of Bothwell up to the time when he made her his prisoner ; and after that time none of the incidents to which the letter refers could have occurred.

When the conspirators published this letter they put out with it, and sometimes instead of it, what they called a "translation into our language." Our readers

Those, Lord, who would Thee in their offerings please,
Must come in faith, by Hope immortal led,
With charity to man, and duteous tread
Thy paths, unmurmuring at thine high decrees.
This the oblation that is sweet to Thee :
A spirit tuned to prayer and thoughts divine
Meek and devout, in body chastely pure ;—
O Thou All-powerful ! grant such grace to me
That all these virtues in my heart may shine,
And to Thy glory evermore endure.

[1] *Ante*, p. 105.

may remember that beautiful passage in the letter in which Mary spoke of her loneliness when separated from her husband, like a bird away from its cage, or a turtle-dove that has lost its mate. The conspirators circulated everywhere as the translation of that passage, representing it always as a letter by Mary to Bothwell: "Mak gude watch gif the burd eschaipe out of the cage;" thus converting Mary's poetical and affectionate thought into an instruction to Bothwell to watch Darnley in case he should escape. The intention of this manifest falsification (and it exists also in Buchanan's Latin translation) is to make the letter, which avowedly has reference to the warning given to Darnley by the Lord Robert Stewart,[1] appear to have been intended for Bothwell, and to connect the Queen with a plan to intercept Darnley in case that warning should have led him to seek safety in flight.[2]

Another of the letters produced by Morton tells its story on its face. One of Mary's ladies, who, her accusers say, was Margaret Carwood, the same who was married on the night before the murder, had let her tongue loose upon Darnley—for which perhaps

[1] Goodall, ii. 142 and ii. 248, Feb. 8.

[2] The passage in the original French is—"Comme l'oyseau eschappé de la cage, ou la tourtre qui est sans compagne, ainsi je demeureray seule, pour pleurer vostre absence, quelque brieve qu'elle puisse estre." Buchanan's Latin translation of it is nearly as dishonest as the Scotch, and conveys a similar false suggestion: "*Si* avis evaserit e cavea, aut sine compare, velut turtur, ego remanebo sola ut lamenter absentiam tuam quamlibet brevem." The letter, in French, Latin, and Scotch, is published by Goodall, ii. 35.

he had given sufficient cause—and he, silly lad as he was, had run with his tale to the Queen, and obviously huffed and pouted about it. Can that apply to Bothwell? Imagine that reckless iron man running like a big baby to tell mamma that Margaret had been saucy! It is a cap that fits Darnley, but assuredly not Bothwell. And then she writes this coaxing letter to console the boy, suggesting that she couldn't have hindered it without speaking of it. She says, "when she shall be married, I pray you to give me another, or I shall take one whose ways shall please you." She pawkily adds—and one can see that she felt a touch of the ludicrous, we may almost conceive a twinkle in her eye as she wrote it—"But as for their tongues, or faithfulness toward you, I will not answer." The whole tone of the letter shows that it is written to a petted youth; and she goes on to talk of her voluntary subjection, which was just the salve to apply to poor Darnley's sore, but surely not the tone she would have used to the bold strong man who domineered over her so harshly from the hour he seized her.

Another of the letters which Morton produced against Mary at Westminster was quietly put aside by the English ministers without remark. Murray's instructions[1] bear that eight letters were produced to them, and eight were printed and circulated by him; but Elizabeth's commissioners recorded the production of only seven.[2] The eighth letter deserves

[1] Goodall, p. 87. [2] Goodall, p. 235.

special consideration. Robertson says[1]—"The eighth letter was never translated into French. It contains much refined mysticism about devices, a folly of that age of which Mary was very fond, as appears from several other circumstances, particularly from a letter containing impresas by Drummond of Hawthornden. If Mary's adversaries forged her letters, they were certainly employed very idly when they produced this." Robertson had not the key which we now have to this letter. He was ignorant of the secret marriage between Mary and Darnley. But Randolph's letter, which is for the first time published in this volume,[2] proves that it was well known to Elizabeth and her ministers. And whenever they read the letter they must have seen, by the allusions which it makes to that secret marriage (unintelligible though these have been to the world for the greater part of three centuries), that it was a letter by Mary to Darnley, not to Bothwell, and written during the interval between the private and the public marriage, when Darnley was, as they well knew, in constant danger of being assassinated.[3] They might well put it aside. A few extracts from it will show its real character.

"If the weariness of your absence, added to your forgetfulness, and the fear of danger so threatened by all to your much-loved person, may give me consolation, I leave to you to judge." But, "for all that, I

[1] *Dissertation*, p. 230. [2] Appendix No. VI.

[3] *Ante*, p. 38.

will never accuse you, neither of your little remembrance nor of your little caution,[1] and least of all of your promises broken,[2] or of the coldness of your writing, since I am always so far made yours that that which pleases you is acceptable to me." "Ye only uphold of my life, for whom alone I will preserve the same, and without whom I desire nothing but sudden death." "My dread to displease you, my tears for your absence, *the sorrow that I cannot be in outward effect yours*, as I am without feignedness of heart and spirit." "I shall take pains to be bestowed worthily under your guidance—my only wealth. Receive, therefore, in as good part the same, *as I have received your marriage with extreme joy*, which shall not part forth of my bosom *until that marriage of our bodies be made in public* as sign of all that I either hope or desire of bliss in this world." "She that will be for ever unto you *humble and obedient lawful wife*, that for ever dedicates unto you her heart, her body, unchanging, as unto him that I have made possessor of the heart, of which you may hold you assured that unto the death shall nowise be changed; for evil nor good shall never make me go from it."

[1] Cair, in the original.

[2] Randolph wrote of Darnley at this period—"To all honest men he is intolerable, and almost forgetful of his duty to her already, that hath adventured so much for his sake. . . . This may move any man to pity that ever saw her; . . . for the love of him that ever I judged the most unworthy to be matched to such a one as I have known her and seen her to be" (21st May 1665, Reaumur, p. 48).

Some circumstances indicate that portions of other genuine letters by Mary to her husband may also have been used for supplying interpolated passages in the long memorial, whose character has already been discussed.

There is one remarkable feature of all the letters which Morton brought forward—they bear no date, no signature, no address. The date, signature, and address were then commonly on the last leaf, and were gone on each of the papers. That leaf was possibly taken off after the date of the Council minute which first charged Mary with the murder, for in that minute they describe the letters as "*subscryvit* with her awen hand," which, when produced, they certainly were not.[1]

While Mary was a prisoner in England, Murray, Morton, Lethington, and their supporters, after much coquetting for terms, gratified Elizabeth in the end by making before her the formal charge of murder against Mary, and by exhibiting these precious papers and all their proofs.[2] But the English judges must soon have seen through the true character of these writings, for when Mary became urgent in her demands to see the letters, Elizabeth sent Murray and them back to Edinburgh, and set on foot a scheme of compromise.[3] Her

[1] Act of Secret Council, 4th Dec. 1567 (Goodall, ii. 62).

[2] The Queen of England, having obtained her intent, received great contentment. First, she thought she had matter for her to show wherefore she retained the Queen; then she was glad too of the Queen's dishonour (Melville's *Memoirs*, Bannatyne, Edinburgh).

[3] Goodall, ii. 279 and 300.

written instructions to the negotiator whom she employed desire him "so to prepare your speech (to the captive Queen) as coming only of yourself, and not by any direction; but rather seeming that you would be glad to deale herein for her; and as you shall see cause to use any other reasons to induce her to this purpois. . . . And lest she may have some speeche hereof with the Lord Scroope, we thynk it good that you inform hym of the same also with great secrecy, that he may agree with you in opinion. . . . And in anywise not to be known that you are directed from us in this cause." Elizabeth's whole game at that time was to get a slur thrown on Mary, for the purpose of discrediting her with the Catholic party and the country, and to give her some pretext to foreign powers for keeping her in prison.[1] She provided Murray with £5000 when he had done her this service.[2] And as Mary was still clamorous, and no doubt some of Elizabeth's Privy Councillors disgusted, the English Council finally recorded that "there had been nathing sufficiently producit nor schowin be them (Murray and his accomplices) againis the Quene thair Soverane, quhairby the Quene of Ingland sould conceave or tak ony evil opinioun of the Quene her guid sister for onything yit sene;"[3]—the four spiteful words at the end being perhaps introduced by Eliza-

[1] Privy Council Minute (Goodall, ii. 278).

[2] See his acknowledgment and obligation, £5000, 18th Jan. 1568-9, in Goodall, ii. 313.

[3] 10th January 1568-9 (Privy Council Minute, printed by Goodall, ii. 305).

beth herself, and at all events obviously intended to prevent the sore from being fully healed. This was more than a month after the forged writings, and all the evidence that Murray and Morton could produce, had been examined by Elizabeth and her Privy Council, with the aid of her Judges.[1] Seeing these papers were withheld from Mary, and such an acknowledgment left by her bitterest enemies, one cannot but be amazed that the authenticity of the papers should have been assumed by such authors as Froude, Mignet, and Lamartine, as well as the younger Tytler. And it must be remembered that this was not a mere speculative opinion of the English Council, but a great Act of State relating to the next heir of the English throne. If they had seen ground to implicate Mary in a charge of murder, it would have been their duty to advise measures for excluding her claims to succeed, which the most powerful of them had always earnestly desired on account of her religion. The Duke of Norfolk, who was Elizabeth's chief commissioner for the examination of these papers, entered into a secret treaty for marriage with Mary; and Elizabeth was so much alarmed for the consequences that she sent him to the scaffold. He thus testified with his blood his belief in Mary's innocence.[2] Even Cecil seems to have been so con-

[1] See Goodall, ii. 235, 239, 241, 257.

[2] Hume says the Duke of Norfolk "believed the papers authentic, and was fully convinced of Mary's guilt," and that the Duke acknowledged this to Bannister, his most secret confidant. But the author finds that, when this was alleged at the Duke's

vinced of the murder charge having been for ever exploded, that when he, some time afterwards, drew up a list of accusations against Mary, he thought of bringing her to trial for *marrying* Darnley, an English subject, without Elizabeth's consent, but there was not another word about his death.

How, then, did the letters by Mary to her husband come into the hands of Morton ? He confessed, as we have seen, that Archibald Douglas, who was his cousin and agent, reported to him that he had been at the King's death ; and Morton's possession of letters which must have been got at that time, is an additional link to the chain which, without it, brought the murder home to both him and Archibald.

trial (which cost him his life), his Grace replied—" Bannister was shrewdly cramped (put to torture) when he told that tale. I beseech you let me have him brought face to face." According to Hume, also, " the account given by Morton of the manner in which the papers came into his hands is very natural!"—" the very disappearance of these letters is a presumption of their authenticity!" and he suggests that they may have been put out of the way by King James's friends. He mentions that Crawford's evidence disappeared from the Cotton Library, and that " this must have proceeded from the like cause." But Crawford's evidence is in the State Paper Office to this day.—He acknowledges that " the sonnets are inelegant ;" but thinks it a sufficient explanation to remark that " criminal enterprises leave little tranquillity of mind for elegant poetical compositions!" Such has been the influence of partisanship in this question upon even so great a writer as Hume.

CHAPTER XXVI.

We must return for a moment to the period which preceded Darnley's death. The attempt which was made, two months before that event, to persuade the Queen to divorce him, has already been mentioned. It is very fully recited in a "protestation" of the Earls of Huntly and Argyle, two of the lords who joined in the proposal.[1] They state that Murray and Lethington came to them at Craigmillar in the end of November or beginning of December, first to Argyle while in bed, and next to Huntly, proposed the divorce, and induced them to agree; that the four then went together to Bothwell, and having obtained his concurrence, passed with him to the Queen's presence. Lethington, in the name of them all, "remembered her Majesty of a great number of grievous and intolerable offences that the King had done, (and that he was) continuing every day from evil to worse," proposed a divorce, and represented "that it was necessary that her Majesty take heed to make resolution therein, as well for her own easement as the welfare of the realm;" adding that the King "troubled her Grace and us all," and that he would not cease "till he did her some other evil turn," which she would find it hard to remedy.

[1] Goodall, ii. 316. See Appendix hereto, No. XIX.

Then they all joined in similar persuasions, urging (as we are told in a separate writing of the Scottish lords, signed by Argyle and Huntly among the rest[1]) that the marriage was "null for consanguinity, in respect they alleged the Pope's dispensation had not been published." She said she might "understand" their proposals if the divorce could be made, first, lawfully, and second, without prejudice to her son, for without these conditions she would rather "abide the perils that might chance in her Grace's lifetime." They tried to assure her on these points; but she replied, speaking of her husband: "Peradventure he would change opinion, and that it were better that she herself for a time passed into France, abiding till he acknowledged himself." Lethington replied: "Madam, fancy ye not we are here of the principal of your Grace's nobility and Council that shall find the means that your Majesty shall be quit of him, without prejudice of your son?" He added: "Albeit that my Lord of Murray here present be little less scrupulous for a Protestant than your Grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto, and will behold our doings, saying nothing to the same." The Queen's Majesty answered: "I will that ye do nothing wherethrough any spot may be laid to my honor or conscience; and therefore, I pray you, rather let the matter be in the estate as it is, abiding till God of his goodness put remedy thereto, that you, believing to do me service, may possibly turn to my hurt and displeasure." "Madam," said

[1] Goodall, ii. 359.

Lethington, "let us guide the matter among us, and your Grace shall see *nothing but good*, and *approved by Parliament.*"

Mr. Froude insinuates that the Queen must have understood these as suggestions of murder, and he omits Lethington's closing assurance. He adds: She said generally that she would do what they required;[1] "*they had better leave it alone.*"[2] He gives these words in inverted commas, as proceeding from the Queen's mouth. On referring to the narrative on which he founds (which we give in the Appendix No. XIX.), the reader will find that they are entirely his own.

The conditions stated by the Queen were indeed checkmate to their scheme of divorce. How could the marriage be lawfully annulled from the beginning without risking the child's claims to succeed to both Crowns? So far from assenting to their scheme of divorce, the Queen interposed a practical difficulty which absolutely put an end to it. They did not attempt to proceed farther with it, but were driven to other devices. Its immediate effect was to bring the Queen and King together,[3] though he broke off again after the Prince's baptism.

[1] Froude, viii. 345.

[2] *Ibid.* viii. 347.

[3] El Rey de Escocia ha ya viente dias que esta con la Reyna, y comen juntos; y, aunque parece que no perderá tan presto del todo el desgusto del Rey per las cosas pasadas,

The King of Scotland has, for these twenty days, been with the Queen, and they eat together; and although it is not likely that her distaste of the King for the past occurrences

But Mr. Froude, in his anxiety to inculpate the Queen, here found that he had brought himself into a difficulty as to his "stainless Murray." For if Lethington's proposals pointed to murder, what is to be said of Murray's acquiescence in the declaration that he was to look through his fingers at the deed? Mr. Froude thinks it enough to say: "Such subjects are not usually discussed in too loud a tone, and *he may not have heard them distinctly!*"[1] Yet the document to which Mr. Froude refers proves that the entire proposal (whatever it meant) originated with Murray and Lethington.

What darker eventualities may have been in their minds is a different question. But it is unfair to insinuate that their words, at the time they were spoken, conveyed any other than their natural and legitimate meaning to the Queen.

And why did they speak of *divorce* at all? Why not then have proposed, as they afterwards did (their

todavia piensa que el tiempo, y estar juntos, y el Rey determinado de complacerle hará mucho en la buena reconciliacion (De Silva to Philip, December 18, 1566; MS. Simancas).

will so soon be wholly overcome, yet it is thought (*qu.* I think) that time and their being together, and the King being resolved to please her, will do much towards a satisfactory reconciliation (De Silva to Philip, December 18, 1566; MS. Simancas).

This letter is dated three days after the Prince's baptism, and about three weeks after the proposal of divorce had been made to the Queen.

[1] Froude, viii. 346.

last cast before proceeding with the murder), to convict Darnley of treason?[1] Obviously because they

[1] They offered "to get him convict of treason because he consented to her Grace's retention in ward," "quhilk altogedder hir Grace refusit, as is manifestlie knawin, so that it may be clearly considered hir Grace having the commoditie to find the means to be separate and yet wald not consent thereto, that hir Grace wald never have consentit to his murthour having sic uther likelie means to have been made quit of him be the Lord's own device" (Instructions of the Scottish Nobles and Prelates, etc., 12th September 1568; Goodall, ii. 359). This is remarkably confirmed by the following extract of a letter of the Spanish ambassador to Philip, king of Spain :—

Habia entendido que viendo algunos el desgusto que habia entre estos Reyes, habian ofrecido á la Reyna de hacer algo contra su marido, y que ella no habia venido en ello. Aunque tuve este aviso de buena parte parecióme cosa que no se debia creer que se hubiese tratado con la Reyna semejante platica (De Silva to Philip, 18th January 1567; MS. Simancas).

I have heard that some persons, seeing the antipathy which existed between the King and Queen, had offered to the Queen to do something against her husband, and that she had not consented to it. Although I had this information from a good source, it seemed to me to be a matter which was not credible that any such overture should be made to the Queen (De Silva to Philip, 18th January 1567; MS. Simancas).

This letter is published in Spanish by Mr. Froude (viii. 347 and 348), so that it is not intelligible to the general reader. He misplaces it, putting it before De Silva's letter of 18th December (footnote, *supra*), and represents it as an account of the proposal of divorce made in the end of November or beginning of December. It is not likely that De Silva would have been so far behind with his news. The date of this letter corresponds remarkably with the date of Morton's return to Scotland (10th January), and his immediate meeting at Whitting-

feared that, on the slightest hint of harm to him, the quarrel between her and her husband would be, as it was eventually, appeased.

At the time when this proposal of divorce was made, Archibald Douglas was carrying on his secret negotiations between Morton and his banished accomplices on the one hand, and Murray, Bothwell, Argyle, and Lethington, on the other, the basis of which was that Morton and his comrades were to join in the league against Darnley;[1] and of the five coun-

hame with Lethington, Bothwell, and Archibald Douglas (see Drury's letter of 23d January 1566-67—Tytler, vii. 442; and Archibald Douglas's statement, in footnote *infra*).

[1] Archibald Douglas's narrative, addressed to the Queen when she was a prisoner in England, states: "I was permitted to repair in Scotland, to deal with Earls Murray, Athol, Bodwel, Arguile, and Secretary Ledington, in the name and behalf of the said Earl Morton, Lords Reven, Lindsay, and remanent complesis, that they might make offer in the names of the said Earl of any matter that might satisfy your Majesty's wrath, and procure your clemency to be extended in their favours. At my coming to them, after I had opened the effect of my message, *they declared that the marriage betwixt you and your husband had been the occasion already of great evil in that realm;* and if your husband should be suffered to follow the appetite and mind of such as was about him, that kind of dealing might produce with time worse effects; for helping of such inconvenience that might fall out by that kind of dealing, *they had thought it convenient to join themselves in league and band with some other noblemen*, resolved to obey your Majesty as their natural sovereign, and have nothing to do with your husband's command whatsoever;—if the said Earl would for himself enter into that band and confederacy with them, they could be content to humbly request and travel by all means with your Majesty for his pardon; but before they could any farther proceed, they desired to know the said Earl's mind herein.

cillors who made the proposal of divorce, we now know for certain that Lethington, Huntly, and Bothwell were directly concerned in the King's murder; Argyle sat as justice-general and chief judge at Bothwell's trial, and promoted his collusive acquittal; and

When I had answered that he nor his friends, at my departure, could not know that any such like matter would be proponit, and therefore was not instructed what to answer therein, they desired that I should return sufficiently instructed in this matter to Sterling, before the baptism of your son, whom God might preserve. This message was faithfully delivered by me at Newcastle in England, where the said Earl then remained, in presence of his friends and company, where *they all condescended* to have no farther dealing with your husband, and *to enter into the said band.* With this deliberation I returned to Sterling, where, at the request of the most Christian King, and the Queen's Majesty of England, by their ambassadors present, your Majesty's gracious pardon was granted unto them all, under condition always that they should remain banished forth of the realm the space of two years, and further during your Majesty's pleasure; which limitation was after mitigated at the humble request of your own nobility;—so that, immediately after, the said Earl of Morton repaired into Scotland to Quhittingaime, where the Earl of Bodwell and Secretary Ledington came to him. What speech passed there amongst them, as God shall be my judge, I knew nothing at that time, but at their departure I was requested by the said Earl of Morton to accompany the Earl Bodwell and Secretary to Edenburgh, and to return with such answer as they should obtain of your Majesty; which being given to me by the said persons, as God shall be my judge, was no other than these words:—'Shew to the Earl Morton that the Queen will hear no speech of that matter appointed unto him.'"—This was no doubt the occasion on which the Queen was urged to issue a warrant for treason against Darnley; and the Queen's refusal to hear speech of the matter, as told by Douglas, agrees with the Spanish ambassador's letter of 18th January (footnote, *supra*, p. 192). Mr. Archibald proceeds:—"When I craved that the answer might be more

Murray's acts were altogether conformable to the programme which Lethington laid out for him and he acquiesced in. He "looked through his fingers" at their doings.

His more active participation in the King's death was probably excused by his fellow-conspirators, just as it had been on the occasion of Riccio's assassination. It was necessary to the success of their schemes that his hands should if possible appear to the world to be unstained, as Mr. Froude thinks they were. We know that of design he was absent till Riccio had been disposed of,[1] and he left Edinburgh opportunely on the day before the King's murder, though entreated by the Queen, and required by important public duty, to remain. He lost little time in availing himself of the King's death to secure the ratification of his estates, which he had desired so long; and the fact that the conspirators, with one voice, placed him at their head in the moment of final success, and awarded to him the chief spoils of their deed, shows how fully *they* recognised his concurrence.

sensible, Secretary Ledington said that the Earl would sufficiently understand it, albeit few or none at that time understand what passed amongst them. It is known to all men, als weill by raillling letters passed betwixt the said Earl and Ledington when they became in divers factions, as also ane book sett furth by the ministers, wherein they affirm that the Earl of Morton has confessed to them, before his death, that the Earl Bodwell came to Quhittingaime to propone the calling away of the King your husband, to the which proposition the said Earl of Morton affirms that he could give no answer unto such time he might know your Majesty's mind therein, which he never received."

[1] See *ante*, pp. 54, 55.

CHAPTER XXVII.

A FAIR consideration of the history, as a whole, exonerates Mary Stuart of the guilt with which her memory has been loaded. Even if her affection for her husband had been destroyed by his misconduct, her interests and ambition prompted her to forgive him. Her eyes had been fixed through life on the throne of England, which she believed to be rightfully hers. Her marriage with Darnley had first been suggested to strengthen that claim. Her hopes there had never been so high as at the time of her child's baptism, and it was thus a vital object to her to retain the support of Darnley's party in England.

Darnley was looking in the same direction. Even while in Glasgow, apart from the Queen, he engaged in intrigues against Elizabeth's Crown which would have been meaningless if he was to remain apart from his wife. Elizabeth well understood their true feelings towards each other. She held an anxious inquiry, only a week before Mary and her husband were finally reconciled, into a plot of Darnley's for seizing Scarborough Castle, in Yorkshire, where the Catholic party was very strong, as an advanced post towards a rising against her. And she had recently discovered that the Poles, rival claimants of the English Crown, had

transferred their claims to the Queen and King of Scotland. The public reconciliation which immediately followed was thus nearly as alarming to Elizabeth as to any of the Scottish nobles.

But if we could, nevertheless, suppose that Mary was willing to sacrifice the scheme of her life, to which Darnley was thus essential, what are we to think of the manner of his death?

She had but to withhold her protection from him, and the fierce and powerful men whom he had mortally offended would at once have brought him to justice and the block.[1] There was undeniable proof of his treason, in the conspiracy against Riccio, which had cost the Queen her liberty. And yet we are asked to believe that she, having his life lawfully in her hands, and whose resolute will alone barred the law from execution, chose to creep to his bedside; to fawn upon him; to kiss him, like Judas, that she might betray him; to plot, lie, and do things which her accusers' very forgeries represent her as speaking of

[1] Goodall, ii. 359. The instructions by Huntly, Argyle, Crawford, Eglinton, and other noblemen and prelates, for Mary's vindication, contain the following remarkable passage:—

"They (*i.e.* Murray and his accomplices) heiring of the zoung behaviour throw fulage counsal of her said husband, causit mak offeris to our said Soverane Lady, gif her Grace wald give remissioun to them that were banishit at that time, to find causes of divorce, outher for consanguinitie, in respect they alledgit the dispensation was not publishit, or else for adulterie, or then to get him convict of tressoun, because he consentit to her Grace's retention in ward; or quhat uther wayis to despeche him; *quhilk altogedder her Grace refusit*, as is manifestlie knawin."

with horror,—and all to entice him in her own train from Glasgow to Edinburgh—that he might be there, somewhat more conveniently, blown in the air! If the mode of death was to be so flagrant and reckless, why take so much trouble?—why bring herself needlessly into personal contact with her victim?

Mr. Froude says, that "if Darnley had been stabbed in a scuffle, or helped to death by a dose of arsenic in his bed, the fair fame of the Queen of Scots would have suffered little, and the tongues that dared to mutter would have been easily silenced;"[1] and nothing can be more true.

But if the conception of the murderers was to throw the crime on the Queen, then we can understand why it was done—not for concealment—but with a thunderclap that was to reverberate over Europe. Mr. Froude seems to have felt this difficulty. But he has a theory that it was done in this way by Mary for dramatic sensation. He speaks of her as "wrought up to the murder point by some personal passion, which was not contented with the death of its victim, and required a fuller satisfaction in the picturesqueness of dramatic revenge."[2] Such is his notion of historical probability and truth to nature. He meets the difficulty, on his assumption of her guilt, of accounting for the employment of such an astounding method of murder, which, he says, "challenged the attention of the whole civilised world"[3] (and so it did, and so it was planned to do); and he

[1] Froude, viii. 340. [2] *Ibid.* viii. 340. [3] *Ibid.* viii. 340.

suggests, as an adequate explanation, that it was so done to gratify an assumed passion for sensational drama! He tells us, too, that "with that lightning-flash" "Mary Stuart's chances of the English throne perished also;"[1] and that on the night on which the news reached London, the Catholics began to transfer their allegiance from her. Was not that the result for which Elizabeth had intrigued through so many years, now at last accomplished, under circumstances which were intended to blot the fame of Mary Stuart, but which leave a blacker shadow of suspicion upon herself? When you can lay your finger on the persons who derive most profit from a great crime, you have gone a good way towards the discovery of its authors.

Here is an incident, authenticated by Mary's worst slanderer:—The royal widow had gone to look for the last time on the dead young husband whom she had chosen, at the cost of a rebellion, only nineteen months before, and for whom she had suffered so much. The fountain of her tears was dry; for

> Deep affliction chills the heart, and freezes every tear.

She looked long and earnestly upon that body, the handsomest of his age, but gave no sign by which the secret emotions of her heart could be discovered. What a scene! Could the wit of man imagine anything more tender and pathetic? He who could transfer that picture to canvas would make himself immortal.

[1] Froude, viii. 370.

When Mary Stuart was executed, the executioner claimed her personal ornaments as his perquisite. This was resisted by one of her ladies, Jane Kennedy, afterwards Lady Melville, who could not bear to see them in such hands; and there was a struggle for their possession. Others of her effects were seized by the English Government, and among them there was found a tablet of enamelled gold, bearing a portrait of Henry Lord Darnley, one of her life-cherished treasures.[1] But there was one ring which was not found, which may have been dropped on the scaffold, and swept away among the dust. It was a signet-ring, with the monograms of Henry and Mary knit together by true love-knots, and bearing the date 1565, the year of their marriage. It was found, within the last twenty years, among the ruins of the old castle where she died;[2] thus coming forth, after centuries, as a silent witness that Mary Stuart kept the promise of her last letter to her unfortunate husband, by cherishing her love as long as she had life.

[1] State Papers, vol. xxi. No. 20.

[2] Strickland, vii. 475. The elaborate and careful researches of Miss Strickland have contributed more than those of any other writer to the truth of Mary Stuart's history.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

God dealt out his signal punishments to most of the conspirators, even in this world. But, so far as we know, Archibald Douglas escaped. He is described by a contemporary as "a very old fox;" and, like Morton and Balfour, he had powerful protectors. He returned to Scotland five years after Morton's execution, was tried for the murder of Darnley, and was acquitted. A contemporary writer says the trial was thought to be collusive, and contrived by Randolph and the Master of Gray.[1] The popular belief is fully verified by some remarkable documents now found in the State Paper Office.

Archibald Douglas arrived in Edinburgh in 1586 with a letter, under Queen Elizabeth's own hand, to King James; and James, a true son of Darnley, received him secretly, and bargained for the acquittal of his father's murderer. Mr. Archibald, in a letter to Walsingham, the English secretary, narrates his meeting with James on the 4th of May, his delivery of Elizabeth's letter, and James's assurance that he should have a favourable trial.[2] The Master of Gray was

[1] Moyse's *Memoirs*, p. 108.

[2] "Advertisement was made that the king was coming, and commanded that no man should remain in the chamber. After whose entry some speeches being uttered by me, . . . I de-

foreman of the jury which acquitted Douglas, and nine days before the trial he writes to Walsingham:

"Mr. Archibald Douglas shall be, God willing, very soon put to trial; for the king since my last hath condescended to all things;"[1] and he urges that £1000 of the money promised to James should be sent at once.

Four days after this letter was despatched, James issued a pardon under the Great Seal to Archibald Douglas, for all crimes and treasons,[2] except Darnley's murder; with a singular proviso, that notwithstanding the exception, the pardon should include the foreknowledge and concealing of the murder. Having thus cleared away that important part of the evidence, James gave a special commission to John Prestoun and Edward Bruce, as justices in that part, to proceed with the trial. But even with all this preparation Archibald did not feel himself safe till he packed the jury. By some contrivance a sufficient number of jurymen did not attend. And the complaisant judges

livered Her Majesty's letter, which being read, he uttered these or the like speeches: "At your departure, I was your enemy, and now at your returning I am and shall be your friend." "For your surety I must confess her Ma^ties. request in your favour to be honorable and favorable." "I will impute unto you neither foreknowledge, neither concealing, and desire that you may advise with my secretary what may be most agreeable to my honour and your surety in trial, and it shall be performed" (from original letter by Archibald Douglas to Walsingham, 6th May 1586; State Paper Office, Scotland, Elizabeth, vol. xxxix.)

[1] The full letter, from the original, is in the Appendix, No. XX.

[2] 21st May 1586 (Pitcairn's Trials, vol. i. p. 144).

waited in court while the prisoner, under trial for murder, wrote a letter to the King (!) which brought this rescript :—

"Rex.

"Justices and our advocat, and your deput, we greet you well. We understand that Mr. Archibald Douglas is enterit presently on pannel, and that his tryall stays because that sic persons as are summoned upon his assize compeirs nocht, and that there laiks yet some persons of the perfect number ; therefore it is our will, that according to the laws of our realm and practick of your court, ye supply the absentis with sic gentlemen as ye may get either within our burgh of Edinburgh, *or within the bar*, and cause them to be sworn upon the said inquest, to the effect the said matter receive na langer delay, keepand this precept for your warrant. Subscryvit with our hand at Halyrud House, the 26 day of May 1586.

"James R."

Eight jurymen were then added to the jury from those who attended the prisoner. Morton's confession was kept back, and Archibald successfully pleaded his pardon as excluding evidence of previous concert. The jury of course declared him innocent, and Darnley's worthy son, to conciliate Elizabeth, sent him back to England as his ambassador. For what service Elizabeth wanted him, and how he executed it within twelve months of his acquittal, we shall see afterwards.

Besides a money bribe, it would seem that James had reason to expect that he should be rewarded by his immediate recognition as heir of Elizabeth. He got a formal deed to that effect drawn up and sent to her, and it is amusing to see how Elizabeth evaded this when her purpose was gained. Within a fortnight after Archibald Douglas was acquitted, Cecil (now become Lord Burghly) writes to Randolph—[1]

"1*st*. That the Queen never promised more than £4000.

"2*d*. For the other point, in not returning the instrument signed, her Mat^ie^ hath considered thereof, and found in it something comprised meeter to pass betwixt strange persons that sought assurance of profit by form of words written, and instruments valid in straight form of law, than by favour of mutual kindness and reciproque love, out of which most properlie all liberalitie and points of love doe spring; and for that purpose hir Mat^ie^, respecting rather the substance of the said instrument than the law-like form, did forbeare to admit the same in such form; and did, by her said letter of the 26th of April to that King, declare her mind as well for her [illegible] as for his suretie, and for helping of his neade; as also for the latter clauses required by the instrument concerning the King's satisfaction, that he should not fear anie acts weare to be done by her Ma^tie^ to damnifie him in any such, either in present or future time.

[1] Burghly to Randolph, 1586, June 9th (State Paper Office, Scotland, vol. 40, No. 18).

CHAPTER XXIX.

MARY's escape from Lochleven[1] has been often described both in history and romance. The heart of Scotland had turned in her favour, and supporters crowded to her. Her subsequent defeat at Langside[2] was due to the military skill of Kirkcaldy of Grange, and to her having no soldier of capacity to array her forces. She then threw herself on the protection of Elizabeth,[3] who had treacherously sent her a ring as a pledge that she might rely on her in extremity.

It is not the purpose of these pages to narrate her weary imprisonment in England. We shall notice only, and very briefly, a few things which mark the spirit of her persecutors.

Even as a prisoner she was a constant terror to Elizabeth. Many a scheme was thought of to get rid of her.

Randolph characteristically proposed poison.—There is a letter of Leicester's which proves that during some civil disturbance a warrant was issued under the Great Seal to take her life without trial.[4]—A special

[1] 2d May 1568. [2] 13th May 1568. [3] 16th May 1568.

[4] "Remember how upon a less cause, how effectually all the Council of England once dealt with her Majesty for justice to be done upon that person for being *suspected and infamed* to be consenting with Northumberland and Westmoreland in the rebellion.

envoy, Killigrew, Cecil's brother-in law, was sent to Scotland with written instructions, enforced by Elizabeth in person, to negotiate a scheme for having Mary sent back to Scotland, with secret conditions and hostages to be given for her execution within four hours after she crossed the Border.[1] But the death of Murray and of Mar after they had successively consented, rendered this negotiation abortive.—The one thing which saved Mary's life till the end of nineteen years of captivity was Elizabeth's dread that the world would fix on her the responsibility of her death.

You know the Great Seal of England was sent then, and thought just and meet, upon the sudden for her execution" (letter by Leicester as to Mary Stuart, 10th October 1585 ; Tytler, vii. 463).

[1] *Secret Instructions for H. Killigrew, September* 10, 1572.

(In Lord Burleigh's hand.)

" Upon a singular trust, you are chosen to deale in a third matter, of a farr gretar moment, wherein all secrecy and circumspection is to be used as yourself considere that the matter requireth.

" It is found dayly more and more that the contynuance of the Quene of Scots here is so dangerooss, both for the person of the Quene's Majesty, and for her state and realme, as nothing presently is more necessary than that the realme might be delivered of her ; and though by justice this might be done in this realme, yet for certain respects it seemeth better that she be sent into Scotland, to be delivered to the Regent and his party, so as it may be by some good means wrought, that they themselves would secretly require it ; and that good assurance may be given, that as they have heretofore many tymes, specially in the time of the Quene's former Regents, offered, so they wold without fayle proceed with her by wey of justice, so as nether that realme nor this should be dangered by hir herafter ; for otherwise to have

At last she got a law passed by her Parliament, setting forth that there were plots against her, and rendering responsible for the acts and designs of partisans any person having or pretending right to succeed to the Crown. It enacted a forfeiture of all title to suc-

hir and to kepe hir were of all other most dangeroos. Now, how this may be compassed you ar to considre, at your coming thyther, with whom of the King's party it were best for you to deale, making choiss of some such as yow shall fynde best perswaded of the perill to that state by her continuance either here or there, and such as you shall fynde most addicted to the King ther, and with such you may, as of yourself, secretly conferr; and if otherwise it shall not be directly moved to yow, than you may give the said party some lykelehood to thynk that if ther were any ernest means secretly made by the Regent and the Erle of Morton to some of the Lords of the Counsell here, to have hir delyvered to them, it might be at this tyme better than at any tyme heretofore brought to pass that they might have hir, so as ther might be good surety gyven that she should receive that she hath deserved ther, by ordre of justice, whereby no furder perill should ensue by hir escaping or setting hir upp ageyn. For otherwise you may well saye that the Counsell of England will never assent to deliver hir out of the realme; and for assurance none can suffice but hostages of good valew; that is, some children and near kinsfolk of the Regent and the Erle of Morton.

"Herein you shall, as commodite shall serve yow, use all good spede, with the most secresy that you can, to understand ther mynds; and yet so to deale to your uttermost, that this matter might be rather oppened to you, than yourself to seem first to move it; and as you fynde ther disposition, so to accelerate ther disposition, and to advertise with all spede possible; for so the tyme requyreth, that celerité be used to have this doone before the French enter any deeper ther in credit; and that with all secresy, lest it be interrupted by some furder dangerooss practise" (Murden's *State Papers*, p. 224; Tytler's *Inquiry*, vol. ii. p. 314).

ceed, and the penalty of death. Elizabeth bound her chief nobles and counsellors by an oath of association to persecute "to the death" any who should offend against that act; and then she sent them to try her prisoner. They brought against Mary deciphers, which they said they had taken from letters in cipher written by her secretaries. They refused to let her secretaries come face to face with her. She protested against their jurisdiction, and in her absence they pronounced her guilty. Even Mignet says: "At Fotheringay they examined the accused without the witnesses, and at Westminster the witnesses without the accused."[1] The violence of these proceedings roused the utmost indignation in Scotland. Elizabeth dreaded that the national feeling might drive even James to resist her; and James gathered strength to write to Archibald Douglas, now his ambassador in London, in terms which, if addressed to an honest agent, would probably have arrested the designs on Mary's life:— "Reserve up yourself na langer in the ernest dealing for my mother, for ye have done it too long; and think not that any your travellis can do goode if her lyfe be takin, for then adieu with my dealing with thaime that are the special instrumentis thairof; and therefore, gif ye looke for the continuance of my favour towartis you, spair na pains nor plainnes in this cace, but reade my letter wrettin to William Keith, and conform yourself quhollie to the contentis thairof; and in this request let me reap the fruictis of youre great

[1] Mignet, ii. 318.

credit there, ather now or never.[1] Fairwell. October 1586."

But Mr. Archibald was at Elizabeth's devotion. He exerted every artifice to cajole and intimidate his master. With pretended zeal for the young King's interest, he warned him that the Act of Association might be directed against his own title to the English Crown, if he should take part with his mother.

"Nothing," he wrote to James,[2] "may now cause any doubt to arise against your said title, except that an opinion should be conceived by these lords of this parliament that are so vehement at this time against the Queen, your Majesty's mother, that your Majesty is or may be proved hereafter assenting to her proceedings; and some that love your Majesty's service *were of that opinion, that too earnest request might move a ground whereupon suspicions might grow in men so ill-affected in that matter*, which I tho't might be helped by obtaining of a declaration in parliament of your Majesty's innocence at this time. And by reason that good nature and public honesty would constrain you to intercede for the Queen your mother, which would carry with itself, without any further, some suspicion that might move ill-affected men to doubt, in my former letters I humbly craved of your Majesty that some learned men in the laws might be

[1] Cotton Library, Caligula, c. 9. In James's handwriting. Rob. App. 49.

[2] 16th Oct. 1586, Archibald Douglas to King James (Rob. App. L.)

moved to advise with the words of the Association, and the mitigation contained in the Act of Parliament, and withall to advise what suspicious effects your Majesty's request might work in these choleric men at this time, and how their minds might be best moved to receive reason; and upon all these considerations they might have framed the words of a declarator of your Majesty's innocence to be obtained in this parliament; and failing thereof, the very words of a protestation for the same effect that might best serve for your Majesty's service, and for my better information."

Through these contrivances of the treacherous Douglas, James was reduced to silence, and his mother was left to her fate.

CHAPTER XXX.

THOUGH Mary had been condemned, and James silenced, a serious difficulty remained. The fatal warrant must be signed by Elizabeth's own hand, and how was she to evade the responsibility ?

She signed it. It was executed. She pretended not to know that it was done. She dismissed, disgraced, and ruined Davidson, her secretary, on the pretence that, although she had signed it as a matter of form, he had acted against her intentions in carrying it into execution.

Davidson boldly avowed the truth, at the peril of his life.

He stated—1*st*. That he had absolutely refused to sign the Oath of Association against Queen Mary.

2*d*. That he went out of the way to avoid acting as a commissioner for examining her secretaries.

3*d*. That the warrant was written by the Lord Treasurer, and was given to him, with Elizabeth's privity, to be ready to sign when she should call for it.

4*th*. That he kept it five or six weeks unpresented, till she sent a counsellor for him ; and that he was sharply reproved for his delay by a great Peer in her Majesty's own presence.

5*th*. That he read the warrant to her Majesty, and

that when she had signed it she commanded him to carry it to the Great Seal, and being sealed, to send it immediately away,—herself appointing the hall of Fotheringay for the place of execution, misliking the courtyard in divers respects; and in conclusion, absolutely forbade him to trouble her any further, or let her hear any more hereof till it was done.[1]

Davidson's narrative, which is in manuscript in the British Museum,[2] proceeds :—

"After I had gathered my papers and was ready to depart, shee fell into some complaint of Sir Amias Paulet and others, that might have eased her of this burden, wishing me yet to deal with Mr. Secretary, and that we would jointly write unto Sir Amyas and Sir Drury to sound their dispositions, aiming still at this, that it might be so done as the blame might be removed from herself; and tho' I had always before refused to meddle therein, upon sundrie her Majesty's former motions, as a thing I utterly condemned, yet was I content, as I told her for her satisfying, to let Sir Amyas understand what shee expected at his hands, albeit I did beforehand assure myself it should be so much labour lost, knowing the wisdome and integrity of the gentleman, who, I thought, would not do an unlawful act for any respect in the world. But finding her Majesty desirous to have him sounded in this behalf, I departed from her Majestie w^t promise to signifie so much unto Mr. Secretary, and that we would

[1] See Appendix to Robertson's *History*, No. 52.

[2] Sloane Collection, No. 3199, p. 322 or 105.

both acquaint Sir Amias with this her pleasure; and here repeating unto me again that she would have the matter closely handled, because of her danger, I promised to use it as secretly as I could, and so for that time departed."

Here we must interrupt Davidson's narrative to introduce a passage from a letter sent by her Majesty to Sir Amias Paulet, who, with Sir Drew Drury, had the custody of the imprisoned Queen of Scots :

"To my loving Amias.

"Amias, my most faithful and careful servant, God reward thee treblefold in the double for the most troublesome charge so well discharged. If you knew, my Amias, how kindly, beside most dutifully, my grateful heart accepts and praiseth your spotless endeavours and faithful actions performed in so dangerous and crafty a charge, it would ease your travail and rejoice your heart; in which I charge you to carry this most instant thought, that I cannot balance in any weight of my judgment the value that I prize you at,—and suppose no treasure can countervail such a faith, and shall condemn me in that fault that yet I never committed, if I reward not such desert; yea, let me lack when I most need it if I acknowledge not such a merit, non omnibus datum."[1]

Davidson's narrative proceeds: "That afternoon I repaired to my Lord Chancellor, where I procured the

[1] Tytler's *Inquiry*, ii. 320.

warrant to be sealed; having in my way visited Mr. Secretary, and agreed with him about the forme of the letter that should be written for her Majesty's satisfying to Sir Amyas Paulet and Sir Drury, which at my return from my Lord Chancellor was despatched."

The letters, notwithstanding the request contained in them, have been preserved:—

"We find by a speech lately made by her Majesty, that she doth note in you both a lack of that care and zeal for her service that she looketh for at your hands, in that you have not all this time (of yourselves without other provocation) found out some way to shorten the life of the Scots Queen, considering the great peril she is hourly subject to, so long as the said Queen shall live."[1]

Davidson proceeds: "Next morning I received a message that it was her Majesty's pleasure I should forbear to go to the Chancellor's till I had spoken to her. Then a second message—I went. She asked, Had I been at the Chancellor's? I said I had; she demanded what needed that haste? I answered I had done no more than she commanded. 'But,' says she, 'methinks the best and safest way for me is to have it otherways

[1] There is added in a postscript: "I pray you let both this and the inclosed be committed to the fire; as your answer shall be, after it has been communicated to her Majesty, for her satisfaction." In a subsequent letter: "I pray you let me know what you have done with my letters, because they are not fit to be kept, that I may satisfy her Majesty therein, who might otherwise take offence thereat" (Dr. Mackenzie's *Lives;* Freebairn, p. 270; Tytler's *Inquiry*, vol. ii. p. 321).

handled,' particularising a form that, as she pretended, liked her better. I answered that I took the honorable and just way to be the best and safest way, if she meant to have it done at all; whereto her Majesty, replying nothing for that time, left me.

"Two days after, she told me she had been greatly troubled by a dream, that the Queen of Scots was executed, and that if she had had a sword she would have run some one through. I asked her in great earnest what she meant, and whether she did not mean to go forward with the execution? Her answer, with a solemn oath, was Yes! but it might receive a better form, for this casteth the whole burthen upon myself. I answered that it was the form which the law required, and the only form that was to be kept with honor and justice. She replied there were wiser men than me of a different opinion.

"She rose up and left me.

"The same afternoon she asked if I had heard from Sir Amyas Paulet. I said, No; but in an hour or two I got his answer;" which, though not introduced in Davidson's statement, we insert here :—

"Your letters of yesterday coming to my hand this day, I would not fail, according to your directions, to return my answer with all possible speed, which I shall deliver unto you with great grief and bitterness of mind, in that I am so unhappy, as living to see this unhappy day in which I am required, by directions of my most gracious sovereign, to do an act which God and the law forbiddeth. My goods and life are at her

Majesty's disposition, and I am ready to lose them the next morrow if it shall please her. But God forbid I should make so foul a shipwreck of my conscience, or leave so great a blot to my poor posterity, and shed blood without law or warrant."[1]

Davidson's narrative proceeds: "Next morning I showed her the answer, but finding thereby that he was grieved with the motion made unto him, offering his life and all he had, but absolutely refusing to be an instrument in any such action as was not warranted in honor or justice, she fell into terms of offence, complaining of the daintiness, and as she termed it perjury, of him and others, who, contrary to their oath of association, did cast the burthen upon herself. She rose up, and after a turn or two went into the gallery, whither I followed her, and after renewing her former speech, blaming the niceness of those precise fellows, said she would have it well enough done without them; and named one Wingfield, who, she assured me, would, with some others, undertake it, which gave me occasion to show to her Majesty how dishonorable in my poore opinion any such course would be, and how far off she would be from shunning the blame and stayne thereof.

"Next time I saw her, she said it was more than time this matter were dispatched, swearing a great oath that it was a shame for them all it was not already done; and thereupon spoke to me to have a

[1] Dr. Mackenzie's *Lives*, p. 273; Tytler's *Inquiry*, vol. ii. p. 323.

letter written to Sir Paulet for the dispatch thereof. I answered there was no necessity, as I thought, of such a letter, the warrant being so general, and sufficient as it was. Her Majesty replied little else, but that she thought Sir Paulet would look for it."

Then the warrant was despatched, the deed done, and Elizabeth hypocritically wrote to Mary's son, King James :—

"My deeare Brother—I would you knewe (though not felt) the extreme dolor that overwhelms my mind for that miserable accident which (far contrary to my meaninge) hath befalen. I have now sent this kinsman of mine, whom ere now yt hath pleased yow to favor, to instruct yow trewly of that which ys to yerksom for my penne to tell yow. I beseche yow that, as God and many moe knowe how innocent I am in this case, so you will believe me, that yf I had bid[1] ought I owld have bid by yt.[2] I am not so bace-minded that feare of any livinge creature or prince should make me afrayde to do that were just, or don to denye the same. I am not of so base a linage, nor cary so vile a minde. But, as not to disguise fits not a Kinge, so will I never dissemble my actions, but cawse them shewe even as I ment them. Thus assuringe yourself of me, that as I knowe this was deserved, yet yf I had ment yt I would never laye yt on others' shoulders; no more will I not damnifie myselfe that thought yt not.

"The circumstance yt may please yow to have of

[1] Directed. [2] Would abide by it.

this bearer. And for your part, thincke you have not in the world a more lovinge kinswoman, nor a more deare frend than myself; nor any that will watch more carefully to preserve yow and your estate. And who shall otherwise perswade you, judge them more partiall to others than you. And thus in haste I leave to trouble you; beseechinge God to send yow a longe Reign.—The 14th of Feb. 1586.[1]

"Your most assured lovinge sister and cosin,

"ELIZAB. R."[2]

[1] *i.e.* 1586-7.

[2] Ellis, iii. 22.

CHAPTER XXXI.

We have now come to the close of the story.—Murray won the prize for which he struggled and plotted so long. Within three years he was shot down like a dog on the streets of Linlithgow.[1]—Lethington fell into Morton's hands, and died in one night of poison.[2]—Kirkcaldy was hanged without trial in the face of the sun.[2]—Huntly's time came next. He dropped in the fulness of his strength, and expired within an hour in agony and horror.[3]—Bothwell lingered long in a Danish prison, and became a raving maniac; but he had a lucid interval before he died, and he died confessing before God that he and the rest were guilty, and Mary Stuart innocent.[4]—Morton survived them all. He rose to great power, and took Murray's place as Regent. God is long-suffering, but He is just; and the hour of justice came at last. Morton died by the axe on the scaffold.[5] He confessed; but he concealed, equivocated, and paltered with the truth even in confessing.

[1] 22d January 1570. [2] May 1573. [3] 1576.

[4] April 1576. The authenticity and import of Bothwell's confession has been satisfactorily established by the lamented Aytoun in a historical note to his *Bothwell*, p. 297.

[5] 2d June 1581.

He died as he had lived. Hoping still to deceive man, he passed into the presence of his Maker impiously protesting before God that he was one of God's elect.

Two scenes more, and our task is done.

After much earthly glory, and a long reign, the time came at last when the great Queen Elizabeth must die.[1] Wealth, grandeur, power which none might question,—all were hers. But a cold hand was on her heart. The shadow of death was creeping over her—slow, very slow, but deepening every hour. There was not one left who loved her, or whom she could love. Her most trusted servants trembled at her passions, and longed for a change. Hume tells us she "rejected all consolation. She refused food. She threw herself on the floor. She remained sullen and immovable, feeding her thoughts on her afflictions, and declaring her existence an insufferable burden. Few words she uttered, and they were all expressive of some inward grief which she did not reveal; but sighs and groans were the chief vent of her despondency, which discovered her sorrows without assuaging them."[2]

O the long and unutterable agony of such a time! What is there on earth that could bribe one to bear it willingly? How bitterly she must have realised the words addressed to her by Mary Stuart on the eve of her execution: "Think me not pre-

[1] 3d April 1603.

[2] Hume, ii. 103.

sumptuous, madam, that now, bidding farewell to this world, and preparing for a better, I remind you that you also must die and account to God for your stewardship as well as those who have been sent before you.—Your sister and cousin, prisoner of wrong, MARIE R."

"Ten days and nights Queen Elizabeth lay thus upon the carpet; then her voice left her, her senses failed, and so she died."

Mary Stuart had gone long before, destroyed and done to death by this woman; sent to the scaffold in a land where she had been wrongfully kept a prisoner, to whose law she owed no allegiance, and by virtue of a law which was passed to compass her death. On her way to execution[1] "she was met by her old servant Andrew Melville. He threw himself on his knees before her, wringing his hands in uncontrollable agony. 'Woe is me,' he cried, 'that it should be my hard hap to carry back such tidings to Scotland!' 'Weep not, Melville, my good and faithful servant,' she replied, 'thou should'st rather rejoice to see the end of the long troubles of Mary Stuart. This world is vanity and full of sorrows. I am Catholic, thou Protestant; but as there is but one Christ, I charge thee in His name to bear witness that I die firm to my religion, a true Scotchwoman, and

[1] 6th February 1587. She was then in the 46th year of her age.

true to France. Commend me to my dearest and most sweet son. Tell him I have done nothing to prejudice him in his realm nor to disparage his dignity, and that although I could wish he were of my religion, yet if he will live in the fear of God according to that in which he hath been nurtured, I doubt not he shall do well. Tell him, from my example, never to rely too much on human aid, but to seek that which is from above. Thus he shall have the blessing of God in heaven, as I now give him mine on earth.' . . . . 'May God forgive them that have thirsted for my blood.'"[1]

She then passed to the scaffold. She surveyed it, the block, the axe, the executioners, and spectators undauntedly as she advanced. She prayed in Latin, in French, and finally in English, to God to pardon her sins and forgive her enemies; for Christ's afflicted church, for the peace and prosperity of England and of Scotland, for her son, and for Queen Elizabeth. The two executioners knelt, and prayed her forgiveness. "I forgive you and all the world with all my heart, for I hope this death will give an end to all my troubles." She then knelt down and commended her spirit into God's hands, and the executioners did their work.

The sad tale is told. All the actors have been nearly three centuries in their graves; but their story shall stir the hearts of men till the world's end.

[1] Strickland, vii. 485.

He who ruleth over all, and maketh even the wrath of man to praise Him, chose these instruments to work out his own wise purposes for his church and people; and thus in later times we can sympathise with the unfortunate Mary, and happily adopt her banner of free opinion, while adhering to those Protestant principles which her persecutors sought to enforce in violation of their spirit.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

EXTRACT from Sir RALPH SADLER'S Instructions by QUEEN ELIZABETH.--8th August 1559.

It shall do well to explore the very truth, whether the Lord James do mean any enterprise towards the Crown of Scotland for himself or no; and if he do, and the Duke be found very cold in his own causes, it shall not be amiss to let the Lord James follow his own device therein, without dissuading or persuading him anything therein.

No. II.

LETTER, the LORD JAMES, Prior of St. Andrews, to the DUKE of NORFOLK.—8th March 1559. (State Paper Office. This has been printed by Mr. Tytler.)

Please your Grace, after my departing from Berwick I safely arrived in Fife, and found my Lord of Arran in St. Andrews ready to depart towards my Lord of Huntly in St. Johnston (Perth), with whom I departed towards him; and after mutual conference has found him to see throughout these present matters, and willing to shew himself to the furtherance of the same at this present, which, I suppose, he testifies by his writings to the Queen's Majesty, and also to Mr.

Cecil, with his own servant, who is also instructed with credit. And, if it shall please your Grace, in my opinion these writings should be kept in store for all adventures. Since my returning from my Lord of Huntly, which was on the 1st of this instant, I have been continually travelling in the towns here upon the sea-coast, for preparation of victuals against the arrival of the commissaries, and also upon the preparation of our folks, assuring ourselves of meeting upon the day appointed.

* * * * * *

At Pittenweem, the 8th March 1559 (1560).

JAMES STEWART.

EXTRACT from LETTER, the LORD JAMES to SECRETARY CECIL.—8th March 1559-60.

My Lord of Huntly with a great part of the north, as I look for, will keep the affixed betwixt my Lord Duke and us; whereof I trust you will be certified by his own writing, which I would wish were kept in store.

No. III.

ADDRESS by the KIRK to MARY; and her ANSWER.—25th June 1565.

The General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, just before Darnley's marriage,[1] addressed the Queen in language that was obviously meant to be offensive, demanding "that the papistical and blasphemous mass, with all Papistrie and Idolatrie, be universally suppressed and abolished through the haill realme, not only in the subjects, but also in the queen's

[1] Keith, old edition, p. 541; 25th June 1565.

Majesties awin person, with punishment against all persons that shall be deprehendit to offend and transgress the same." The Queen answered, on the same day,[1] that "she believed the religion in which she had been up-brocht to be weill grounded," but "she neither has, in times byepast, nor yet means hereafter, to press the conscience of any man, but that they may worship God in sic sort as they are persuadit to be best." "As soon as Parliament holds, that quhilk the three Estates agrees upon among themselves, her Majesty shall grant the same to them;—and always make them sure that no man shall be troublit for using themselves in religion according to their conscience."

No. IV.

QUEEN MARY'S INSTRUCTIONS to her Ambassador, sent to QUEEN ELIZABETH, in regard to the Religious Troubles in France.—December 1562.

Ze sall impart to oure said gude sustar the unquyet thochtis and manifeld cairis quhilkis this troublesum tymes dois breid unto ws, quhairin the present calamiteis we see be so greit, that they cannot wele ressave ony incress, and zit we cannot bot feare werss to cum. The desolatioun alreddy chansed in that noble realme is lamentable to all men, be thai nevir so far strangearis unto it; zea I think very inymeis in quhome nator mon worke sum horror or compassioun, eyther for pitie, at leist for the examples saik, to see the people of ane cuntre, kynsfolk and bretheren, ryn blyndlings and hedlong to the distructioun the one of the uther: bot to us mon be maist dolorous for the honor and particular inter-

[1] Keith, old edition, p. 49; 25th June 1565.

est we haif thair. We consider the brader the flamb groweth, it sall entangle and endanger all the nychbouris the more: and thairfore Christian luif and common charitie requirethe, that every one put to his helping hand to quenche the fire. The mater is so far gone alreddy, and oure conscience begynnis to prik us, that we haif too long forborn to deal in it sa far as we micht convenientlie, at leist to assay, gif be our mediatioun any gude micht be wrocht. . . . It hes bene oure mishap, that the persounis in the warld quha are most deare and tendir to ws, is incidently fallin so deid in this querell of France, that thay ar becum as principall parties and on contrary sydes; we ferit that entering once to meddle any wyss in it, we culd nocht so justlie hald the balance, nor so indifferentlie, bot we suld appeir to inclyne moir to the one syde, and be that meayne offend the uther; so that how uprichtlie so evir oure proceding suld be, we suld thairby hasard the losse of sum of oure derest freindis. This preposterous fear hes thus long kept ws in suspense: bot now quhen we wey on the other part the mater to be so far gone alreddy that it mon eyther end be victorie or ellis be treaty; the victorie quhatsoevir it sall be to utheris, it must to ws be most dolorous, for quhosoevir wyn, oure dearest freindis sall losse, having on the one part oure gude suster, and on the uther the King oure gude bruther and oure uncles, so that we cannot bot abhor to think that we sall be spectatrix of so unplesand a bargayne: for avoyding of the quhilk, of necessitie we mon turne oure self to the only remedie that remains, to haif the mater, gif it be possible, takin up be treaty; quhairof as nane hes bettir caus to be desirous, so gif oure crydet be als gude with the parties, as oure affectioun towerdis baith dessins, thair can be nane mair fit ane instrument to procure gude wayis. Mary, we wald be laith to intervein without the gude will and pleasour of baith the partyis:—ze sall thairfore desyre

upoun oure behalf to knaw oure said gude susteris dispositioun, and finding the same conformable, ze sall offer oure labouris, credit, and quhatsoevir we may do to see the mater amicabillie componit and takin up, to the ressonable and honorable contentatioun of baith the parteis. And that we will immediatlie deall with the King oure gude brother on the uther part, the Quene-mother and oure uncles, and perswade thame sa far as we can to apply thair mindis that way: traisting wele that oure credit and auctorite sall be able to wirk the like effect in the myndis of our uncles, in quhome we hope als gude inclinatioun and towardness sall be fund to ony gude purpos, as in ony uther of there estaitis, quhatsoever hes bene to hir reportit to the contrary.

* * * * *

God sall sa bless the werk in oure handis, that it sall be brocht to a happy issue, how difficill soevir it seme, to oure greit comfort, with maire glorie and assurit fame in the eyis and earis of the warlde to hir, then any of oure sex can evir obtein be weir or force of armes. This office is worthie of oure estait and sex, and mair agreable with Christiane religioun than to prosequute materis further be violent meanis.

No. V.

1.

QUEEN MARY'S LETTER to ELIZABETH, for Justice to her Merchants of Wigtoun, plundered in Ireland.

D. Holyrood, le 2 *Juin* 1564.

Richt excellent, richt heich and michtie Princesse, oure dearest suster and cousin, in oure maist harty maner we commend ws unto zou. It hes bene laitlie hevelie lamentit to ws be oure subjects William Waus, Johnne Martine, and Williame

Gordoun, merchauntis of our toun of Wigtoun, how in the moneth of januar last bipast thair schip, quhairof William Carmoke wes maister and William Arnolde shippar, at hir returnyng from the Rochell wes be storme of wedder drevin to land at zour havin of Carlingfurde in Ireland, quhair efter thay had awaittit on the wyndis be the space of twelf dayes, being readie to depart towert this oure realme, and lukand for na kynd of hostilitie or displeasure of ony of zour subjects; Nevirtheles Oneill and Fardarroch Makneyshe, inhabitantes of Irland, accumpanyt with thre or four hundreth personis or thairby, come to the said havin and under silence of nycht violentlie and per force, enterit in the schip, reft and spuilzeit the wynis, irne, and haill merchandice being thairin, brak hir in pecis, and left not the pure mariners samekle as thair clething;—as a testimoniall of the comestable and ballies of zour toun of Carlingfurde mair largelie will testifie.

And seing the pure men awnaris of the saidis schip and guidis be this fact utterlie wrakkit and heryt, we ar movit, dearest suster, to wrait this present unto zou, desiring and praying zou, sen the committares of this attemptat are sic as oure pure subjectz can not enter with in proceesse, and zit the deid of it self being sa schamefull unhonest and notorius, that thairfore ze will command zour deputy or uthers berand charge of zou in Irland, to caus spedie restitutioun and redress be maid to the puir men of thair schip and guidis, according to the treateis of pease and thair necessitie, quhairin as ze will report merite of God, sa may ze be wele assurit that we salhave the semblable regard to the sutis of zour subjectz falland in the like miserie, as occasioun salbe offerit.

And thus richt excellent, richt heich and michtie Princesse, our dearest suster and cousin, we commit zou to the protectioun of God.

Gevin under oure signet at our palace of Halyrudehous, the secund day of junii, and of our regnne the twenty twa zeir, 1564.—Zour richt gude sister and cusignes MARIE R.

Au. dos.—To the richt excellent, richt heich and michty Princesse, oure dearest suster and cousin, the Quene of England.

2.

QUEEN MARY'S LETTER to QUEEN ELIZABETH for Justice to her Merchants of Aberdeen, robbed by English Pirates.

De Struthers, le 7 fevrier 1564-5.

Richt excellent, Richt heich and michtie Princesse our dearest suster and cousin, we grete zou wele. At the supplicatioun of oure loving subjectis Walter Brechin and Andro Brechin brethir, marchandis of oure toun of Abirdene, we wrait from thence unto zou in august bypast, how inhumanlie and cruellie thay war intreatit be Anthony Curteney and uthers zour subjectis, by way of piracie, thair haill guidis spuilzeit fra thame, and thay all desolate sett on land in Bertangze as thay war returnand fra the Rochell towert this oure realme in december past ane zeir. And in prosequutioun of redresse, they togidder did remane in zour realme a lang seasoun, like as this Walter hes continewallie, sen oure above namyt letters war derect to zou in his favouris. Sum decretis hes he obtenit, but na maner of executioun or end: for howsone that evir the decrete is pronuncit, sa sone dois the gilty personis mak appellatiounis to heighar judgeis, and quhen as the puir man eftir his langsum and coistlie sute dois lippin for ready executioun, na thing findis he bot a new pane

to enter in, drevin from terme to terme, quhilk finalie, as disparit to get ony recompanse he most constrenitlie reteir himself hamewart rather nor to contract further dett for maintenance of ye pley.

And thairfore weying and persaving this caise, and finding it sic a mater as apperandlie may be jugeit with far less circumstance nor is usit, we thocht it verie convenient thus of new to wrait to zou to put yis lamentable complaint of our puir subjectis in zour recent memorie, and thair-withall ernestlie and effectuislie to pray zou that ze will gif scharp charge and directioun unto zour justiciers before quhom the mater dependis, to mak haisty despatch and end of ye samyn, as justice and equitie requiris, and that the decretis gevin may tak sic gude executioun as the puir men may think thair expenses maid in prosequutioun of thair caus, wele bestowit. Heirin, dearest suster, as ze sall do a werk acceptable unto God, sa sall ze mak ws yairby oblist to tak the like cair and schaw the semblable favour and benivolence to the sutes of zour subjectis depending or that heirefter salhappin to be persewit within our realm. And thus richt excellent, richt heich and michtie Princess, our richt deare suster and cousin we commit zou to the tuition of God almichtie.

Gevin under oure signet, at the Struther, ye sevint day of februare, and of oure regnne the twenty thre zeir, 1564.—Zour richt gude suster and cusignes MARIE R.

Au. dos.—To the richt excellent, richt heich and michtie Princesse, oure dearest suster and cousyn, the Quene of England.

No. VI.

LETTER, Mr. RANDOLPH to QUEEN ELIZABETH, as to Mary's Secret Marriage to Darnley, dated 16th July 1565. (From the original in State Paper Office, vol. x. No. 78.)

May it please yo^{r} Ma^{tie}.

In a matter whearof I had no greate certayntie I wrote to S^{r} Nicolas Throkmorton as then I was informed, desyeringe him to let yo^{r} Ma^{tie} knowe the same, w^{ch} nowe I have tried that then it was falce, but nowe truste that I maye write it wth better assurance. Upon Mondaye laste the ix of this instante, the Q. was maried secretlie in her owne palace to the L. Darlie, not above vij persones present, and went that daye to their bedde to the L. Setons howse (this is knowne by one of the Prestes that were present at the Masse). If this be trewe yo^{r} Ma^{tie} seethe howe her promes is keapte, and by this yo^{r} Ma^{tie} may measure the rest of her doynges; and unfaynedlie I do believe that yo^{r} Ma^{tie} shall finde no fayer wordes then good meaninge.

I will not trouble yo^{r} Ma^{tie} wth the answer of that w^{ch} laste I receaved from yo^{r} highnes, but have written the same to Mr. Secretarie, and also what is desyered at yo^{r} Ma^{tes} handes by such here as are moste at yo^{r} Ma^{tes} divotion, w^{ch} I dowte not but shall greatlie tende to the honour of God, and yo^{r} Ma^{tes} renoune for ever. At Edenbourge the xvi of July 1565.

Yo^{r} Ma^{tes} most humble and obbedient servant

THO. RANDOLPHE.

To the quens Ma^{tie}

my sovereigne.

No. VII.

LETTER, Queen Elizabeth to Mary Stuart. (State Paper Office—Royal Letters, Scotland, vol. ii. Printed by Count Labanoff, vii. 58.)

Le 29 Octobre 1565.

Observant, madame, que de partout j'entends que quelques accidentz advenus entre nous deux naguéres, ont (en l'opinion des regardantz) esbranlés l'amitié entre nous deux ; et cy mon jugement, il me semble, a esté incité par voz déportementz en mon endroict, tellement que, s'il n'y a meilleur ordre mis en noz querelles, tout le monde croira que nous sommes séparez de notre lien d'amitié. Et, quant á moy, je ne puis croire ny ay raison de m'induire á espérer bonne fin de cette affaire, si non par quelques uns députez de par nous deux á ouïr toutes les occasions de cette ingratitude, et que de votre part soyez contente d'en faire quelque honneste et honorable satisfaction, et de mon costé je n'y fauldray point ; tant en ay-je escript, pour avoir reçue tant de vos lettres très amiables, et ayant entendu dernièrement par Mauvissière la grande envie que semblez avoir de mon amitié accoutumée, et aussy ay donné charge á Randall de vous faire quelques offres que je vous mande, si ainsy vous plaira de les accepter d'aussy bon cueur que je les vous présente. Aussy je luy ay déclaré tout au long le discours entre moy et ung de voz subjectz,[1] lequel, j'espére, vous contentera, soubhaitant que voz oreilles en eussent esté juges pour en entendre et l'honneur et l'affection que je monstroit en votre endroict, tout au rebours de ce qu'on dict, que je défendois voz mauvais subjectz contre vous ; laquelle chose se tiendra tousjours trés éloignée de mon cueur, estant trop grande ignominie pour une princesse á souffrir,

[1] Le Comte de Murray qui était venu réclamer sa protection.

non que à faire ; soubhaitant alors qu'on me esclut du rang des princes comme estant indigne d'y tenir lieu. Et, en ceste opinion, je prieray le Créateur de vous mettre au cueur tousjours ce qui vous sera le mieulx á faire, avec mes cordialles recommandations à vous, ma bonne sœur. — 29e Octobre 1565.

Votre très fidelle bonne sœur et cousine,

ELISABETH.

No. VIII.

Sir WILLIAM DRURY to Sir WILLIAM CECIL—16th February 1565-6—as to Mary's fruitless efforts, seconded by Darnley, to induce Bothwell and others to go with them to Mass ; and as to Bothwell's Marriage to the Earl of Huntly's Sister, which was only a few days before Riccio's Murder. (From original in British Museum, Calig. b. x. 382.)

The quene bothe by her selffe @ by others used greate perswatyons to dyversse off her nobelytye to heare masse wth her, att the reseyte off the Frenche order by her husband, w^{ch} they refusyd her,—as thearles off hūteley, Moorton, Marre, bothewell, @ others—therle bodewells refusyng was most marvelyd att, and judgyd to be off the quene woorste taken ;—he schall as to-moroe marry a syster off therle of hūtleys, a proper @ a vartuos jentyllwoman, @ a protestante, w^{ch} wth thearle her brother's parswatyons to hym was the cause of hys denyyng off ytt (the mass). the quene sayd thus to therle of hūtley, my lord goe wth me to masse, your father was & your mother ys off a good relygyon, your enymyes are off the contrary, I have restored you to lybertye @ to the benyfyte off your lyvyng, goe with me ; butt he refusyd

ytt, saying, Madam, I wyle yn your servyse spend my lyffe land @ goodes, butt to goe to the masse I wyle nott; I pray you off pardon; ytt ys agaynste God @ myne contyense—hys mother had viij or x days daly before delte wth hym, whoo ys a greate papyste, & moche geven to wyche crafftes, parswadyng hym to heare masse as that day, affermyng unto hym thatt ytt ys the best meanes for hym to attayne to hys sute w^{ch} sche hathe sythense hys lybertye ben a swter for, as fully and amplely to be restored unto hys landes, w^{ch} yette he ys nott, althoghe he reseyvythe the benyfyte off ytt—for hys forfayture ys not by law yette canselyd, nor he by law yett restored, butt all thys coulde nott move hym. The lord Darnley would have schoote the doore upon the lord roberte, lord Flemyng, oglebe @ others, butt they woold nott yeld to ytt—the quene tooke therle bodewell by the hand, the rather to procure hym yn. the lord of ledyngton refusyd also, so thatt sche was accompanyd butt wth therles. of athell, lenoxe, cassells, @ monggomberye, @ the lord setone. The Imbasador's trayne dyd all goe to the masse butt mounsiur de clearemont; all that refusyd the masse wente to heare Knokes hys sermonde, wereatt was a greatter audyense @ espetyally off the nobelytye, then was sythense the deperture off the banysched Lordes; the greattest parte of hys sermond was Inveyng agaynste the masse.

No. IX.

MARY STUART'S ACCOUNT of Riccio's Murder, in a Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.—2d April 1566.

D'Edimbourg, le 2 *avril* 1566.

Maist reverend fadir, we greit you weill. We received

your depesche sent by captain Mure; and sensyne sindrie novelles having occurrit, knowing not what bruit is passed thereupon, we thought necessary to make you some discourse thereof. It is not unknown to you how our Parliament was appointed to the 12th of this instant moneth of March, to whilk these that were our rebels and fugitives in England war summoned, to have themselves forfeited. The day thereof approaching, we required the King our husband to assist with us in passing thereto; who, as we are assured, being perswaded by our rebels that were fugitive, with the advice and fortification of the earl of Morton, lords Ruthven and Lindsay, their assistars and complices, wha was with us in company, by their suggestion refused to pass with us thereto, as we suppone because of his facility, and subtile means of the lords foresaid, he condescended to advance the pretended religion publisht here, to put the rebels in their roumes and possessions which they had of before, and but our knawledge grant to them a remit of all their trespassess. The saids rebels and their favorars promittit they should forder him to the crown matrimoniall, give him the succession thereof, and ware their lives in all his affairs; and if any would usurp contrary to his authority, they should defend the samyne to their uttermost power, not excepting our own person. Whilks subtil factions being unknown to us, hoping no inconvenience to have been devised or succeeded, we, accompanied with our nobility for the time, past to the Tolbuith of Edinburgh for holding of our Parlament upon the 7th day of this instant—elected the Lords Articulars. The spirituall estate being placed therein in the ancient maner, tending to have done some good anent restoring the auld religion, and to have proceeded against our rebels according to their demerits. Whilk for such occasions as are notourly known, we thought necessarly should be punisht, likeas of truth the crimes committed

by them being notified and made patent in face of our estates in Parliament assembled, were thought and reputed of such weightiness, that they deserved forfaltour therethrow, and the samyne being voted and concluded ; Upon the 9th day of March instant, we being at even about seven hours, in our cabinet at our supper, sociated with our sister the countess of Argyle, our brother the commendator of Halyrudhouse, laird of Creich, Arthur Erskin, and certain others our domestick servitors, in quiet maner, especially by reason of our evill dispositions being counsell'd to sustean ourselves with flesh, having also then past almost to the end of seven moneths in our birth ; the King our husband came to us in our cabinet—placed him beside us at our supper. The earl of Morton and lord Lindsay with their assistars bodin in warlick maner, to the number of eight score persons or thereby, kept and occupied the whole entry of our palace of Halyrudhouse, so that as they believed it was not possible to any person to escape forth of the same. In that mean time the lord Ruthven, bodin in like maner, with his complices, took entry perforce in our cabinet, and there seeing our secretary David Riccio among others our servants, declared he had to speak with him. In this instant we required the King our husband if he knew any thing of that enterprise ? who denyed the samyne. Also we commanded the lord Ruthven, under the pain of treason to avoyd him forth of our presence : declaring we should exhibite the said David before the Lords of Parliament, to be punisht if any sorte he had offended. Notwithstanding, the said lord Ruthven perforce invadit him in our presence (he then for refuge took safeguard, having retired him behind our back) and with his complices cast down our table upon ourself, put violent hands in him, struck him over our shoulders with whinzeards, one part of them standing before our face with bended daggs, most cruelly took him forth of our cabinet,

and at the entry of our chamber give him fifty-six strokes with whinzeards and swords. In doing whereof, we were not only struck with great dreadour, but also by sundrie considerations was most justly induced to take extream fear of our life. After this deed immediately, the said lord Ruthven coming again in our presence, declared how they and their complices foresaids were highly offended with our proceedings and tyranny, which was not to them tolerable; how we was abused by the said David, whom they had actually put to death, namely in taking his counsell for maintenance of the ancient religion, debarring of the lords which were fugitive, and entertaining of amity with foreign princes and nations with whom we were confederate; putting also upon council the lords Bothwell and Huntly who were traitors, and with whom he associated himself; That the lords banisht in England were the morne to resort toward us, and would take plain part with them in our contrary; and that the King was willing to remit them their offences. We all this time took no less care of ourselves, than for our council and nobility, maintenars of our authority being with us in our place for the time; to wit, the earls of Huntly, Bothwell, Athole, lords Fleming and Livingston, sir James Balfour, and certain others our familiar servitors: against whom the enterprise was conspired as well as for David; and namely to have hanged the said sir James in cords: Yet, by the providence of God the earls of Huntly and Bothwell escaped forth of their chambers in our palace, at a back-window, by some cords; wherein thir conspirators took some fear, and thought themselves greatly disappointed in their enterprize. The earl of Athole and sir James Balfour by some other means with the lords Fleming and Levingston obteined deliverance of their invasion. The provost and town of Edinburgh having understood this tumult in our palace, caused ring their common bell, came to us in

great number, and desired to have seen our presence, intercomoned with us, and to have known our welfare, to whom we was not permitted to give answer, being extremely bosted by thir lords wo in our face declared, if we desired to have spoken them, they should cut us in collops and cast us over the walls. So this community being commanded by our husband retired them to quietness.

All that night we were detained in captivity within our chamber, not permitting us to have intercomoned scarcely with our servant women, nor domestick servitors. Upon the morn hereafter, proclamation was made in "our husbands name, by our advice" commanding all prelates and other lords convened to Parlament, to retire themselves of our burgh of Edinburgh. That haill day we was keeped in that firmance, our familiar servitors and guard being debarred from our service, and we watched by the committars of thir crimes to whom a part of the community of Edinburgh, to the number of fourscore persons assisted. The Earl of Murray that same day at evin, accompanied with the Earl of Rothes, Petarro, Grange, tutor of Pitcurr, and others who were with him in England, came to them, and seeing our state and entertainment was moved with natural affection toward us. Upon the morn, he assembled the interprisars of this late crime, and such of our rebels as came with him. In their council they thought it most expedient we should be warded in our castle of Streviling, there to remain while we had approved in Parlament all their wicked interprizes, establisht their religion, and given to the King the crown matrimoniall, and the haill government of oure realme; or else, by all appearance, firmly purposed to have put us to death or detained us in perpetual captivity. To avoyd them of our palace with their guard and assistars, the King promised to keep us that night in sure guard, and that but compul-

sion he should cause us in Parlament approve all their conspiracies. By this moyen he caused them to retire them of our palace.

This being granted, and the guard commanded to serve us in the accustomate manner (the fear and dreadour always remained with us), we declared our state to the King our husband, certifying him how miserably he would be handled, in case he permitted thir lords to prevail in our contrare ; and how unacceptable it would be to other princes, our confederates, in case he altered the religion. By this perswasion he was induced to condescend to the purpose taken by us, and to retire in our company to Dunbar ; which we did under night, accompanied with the captain of our Guard, Arthur Erskine, and two others only. Of before, we being of mind to have gotten ourselves relieved of this detention, desired, in quiet manner, the Earls of Bothwell and Huntly to have prepared some way whereby they might have performed the same ; who, not doubting therein, at the least taking no regard to hazard their lives in that behalf, devised that we should have come over the walls of our palace in the night upon towes and chairs, which they had in readiness, to that effect.

Soon after our coming to Dunbar, sundry of our nobility, zealous of our weill, such as the Earls of Huntly, Bothwell, Marshall, Athole, Caithness, bishop of St. Andrews, with his kin and friends, Lords Hume, Yester, Sempil, and infinite others, assembled to us, by whose advice proclamations being made for convening our lieges to attend to us and our service, the lords conspirators perceiving the samen, the Earl of Glencairn, as innocent of this last crime, resorted towards us by our tolerance, and hath taken his remission, and sicklike the Earl of Rothes. The Earl of Murray and Argyle sent diverse

messages to procure our favour, to whom in likewise, for certain respects, by advice of our nobility and Council being with us, we have granted remission, under condition they nowise apply themselves to thir last conspirators, and retire themselves in Argyle during our will, thinking it very difficult to have so may bent at once in our contrare, and knowing the promises past already betwixt the King and them; and our force not sufficient, through inhability of our person, to resist the samen, and put the matter in so great hazard.

We remained in Dunbar five days, and after returned to Edinburgh well accompanied with our subjects. The last conspirators, with their assisters, having removed themselves forth of the samen of before, and being presently fugitive from our laws, we have caused by our charges their hail fortresses, strengths, and houses to be rendered to us; have caused make inventar of their goods and geir, and intend farther to pursue them with all rigour. Whereunto we are assured to have the assistance of our husband, who hath declared to us, and in presence of the Lords of our Privy-council, his innocence of this last conspiracy,—how he never counselled, commanded, consented, assisted, nor approved the same; thus far only he oversaw himself, that at the enticement and perswasion of the late conspirators, he, without our advice or knowledge, consented to the bringing home forth of England of the Earls of Murray, Glencairn, Rothes, and other persons with whom we were offended. This ye will consider by his declaration made hereupon, which at his desire hath been publish'd at the mercat Crosses of this our realm. Whereof with thir presents we thought necessary to send you the original. We require you in case of your absence from Court, that ye pass thereto with diligence, to declare all our

proceeding to the King and Queen-mother and our uncle the cardinal of Lorrain, to whom we have also written anent the premisses. And so we commit you to the protection of the Eternal God.

Of Edinburgh, the second day of April 1566.

P.S.—Autographe : Je vous prie ne faillez incontinant ces lettres vues, aller à la Cour, afin que vous puissiez empescher les bruits faux d'estre creus ; et faites en un discours à l'ambassadeur d'Espagne et autres ètrangers.

Votre bien bonne maitresse et amie.

MARIE R.

Au dos.—To the Archbishop of Glasgow.

No. X.

FRAGMENTARY MEMOIR by MARY STUART as to her Marriage with DARNLEY.—(Translation. Autograph—State Paper Office, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xxi. Printed by Count Labanoff.)

The Countess of Lennox by letters and tokens entreated me to marry her son, of the blood of England and Scotland, and the nearest after me in succession, Stuart by name, in order always to preserve that surname so agreeable to the Scotch, of the same religion as myself, and who would respect me according to the honour conferred upon him, in that it should oblige him. The Earl of Atholl, Lord Lindsay, all the Stuarts and Catholics, laid stress upon that.

The Protestants brought forward Leicester, who, on his part, wrote to me and sued me by Randolph : to which Murray pretended to listen, knowing that, although his Queen had

written to me in his behalf, it was merely to deceive me and keep off others. This Leicester himself wrote to me privately, through Randolph, showing me, on the other hand, how to induce her by fear to consent; to wit, by the disturbances in Ireland, where I had power at that time, of which she was much afraid.

Murray, on the other hand, secretly endeavoured to legitimate himself; and, pretending to love me, would not leave me alone, and wished to take charge of all the offices, strongholds, and the whole government of the kingdom; and, as my lieutenant-general, was so well strengthened that he held me in tutelage, and at length proposed to me to cede my crown to him and the Earl of Argyll, and to set aside the Hamiltons as I had Huntly, which induced me to think of consenting to marry, and thereby, if not to please all, at least honest people, Catholics, and those of my own name: whereof I apprised Atholl, and those who urged me to it, that they might ascertain the pleasure of their supporters; and my mother-in-law and her husband thereon endeavoured to procure the restoration of her husband to his honours and estates, and under this pretext be enabled to treat of the marriage of his son with her.

Having effected this, he came hither and began to make use of his friends and tamper with the others, and especially the Earl of Murray, who, thinking that the plan would not be carried into effect, and that he could break it off when he wished, at first appeared to consent to Lennox, under pretext of his name, and in the hope of obtaining his assistance in ruining the Hamiltons, whom otherwise he did not dare to attack.

Lennox, in this expectation, sent for his son; and, in the meanwhile, I held a Parliament, at which by common consent, I restored them to their estates. The son came, but stealthily,

inasmuch as Murray, seeing that I was inclined to this match in good earnest, procured in England that he should be recalled by the Queen.

No. XI.

CARTEL sent by BOTHWELL to ARRAN, with ARRAN'S ANSWER.—1559. (Cotton MS., Caligula, B. viii. 329.)

For samekle as being advertist of zo^{r} continual owtrageouse menassing me and my assistairs, treu subjectis to ye autorite, saying that ze sall expell and constrayn us to depart and laif this our natyve realme of Scotland, but ony sufficient cause quhy, gif it my^{t} ly in zo^{r} handes. And forthir persaving zo^{r} intollerable and oppin malyce in cerseing my body to ye disponing thairof, and spulzeing my hous of guddes and evidences to my greit dam̃aige, and persevereis in zo^{r} said evill mynd (having respect unto my hono^{r}) I am compellit to seise remeid be quhatsumever way I can for defense of ye samyn. And sen it becummeis welle y^{t} na saikles may incur skay^{t} for uthers injuries and demerittis, bot rathar be decydit w^{t} singuleyr combat according unto ye law of armis, that ye offendar may be best knawin and suffer as appartenis ; heirfor knawing zou Erle of Arrane to be ye said principall injurar and menassar bay^{t} be word and deid, desyris to wyt gif ze haif ony pticuleir quarrell towart me or ony of myn quhair of ze wald be revengit, that ze will declayr it, and ane day convenient to be appointit in competent place, I am content to defend ye said quarrell to my hono^{r} befoir Franche and Scottyshe, boding as ze pleis on horse or fuitt, thair to be tryit betwix our bodies unto ye dey^{t} ; Quhen God willing I sall offer me to preif that ze haif no^{t} doyn zo^{r} deutye to ye autorite as ane noble man awcht, nor zet to me in ye causes above wryttin. And

zo^{r} ansueir heyrupon yat we ma proceid efter the forme and ordo^{r} to be observit in sic caces.

At crey^{t}toun ye vij day of November 1559.

BOITHUELL.

In dorso—Cartel sent to the Er. of Ar. by the Erle Bothewell wth ans.

For ansuier of your cartell I haif never menassit ony treu subjectes to the authorite, bot gif ony wald chaiss thaim out of thair native country I wald at my power meynteyn thayme thairin ; bot of that number I neyther esteym zou Erle Bothwell nor zour assistairis, nor zit am accustumyt to use menassing. bot sall God willing be hable to put to executioun the thing I speik, as for that thing I haif doun unto zour self or house it is mekle les nor the injury done be zou to my frenyd deservit. as to the quarrell It is noto^{r} and sik ane deid as efter the sam ze haif na place to seik the combat of ony man of hono^{r} undefamyt, for It is in the self Rather the deid of ane volene to ombesett ane gentlemannis gayt and Rub him of his guddis, than of ane man of hono^{r} as ze call zour self, quhilk ze haif lasthely desteymit in that behalf. As to the revenging, gif ze think it be no^{t} sufficientlye Revengit alreaddy be ze assmyt the next tym I cum that way the thing Is left undoyne now salbe achevit. And quhen soevir ze may recover the Name of ane honest man, quhilk be your lasthe deid ze haif lost, I sall ansueirr zou as I awtht, bot no^{t} befoir Franche quhom ze prepon in Rank to scottis. for thair is no franche man in this realme w^{t} quhais judgement I will haif to do, quhair ze mak mentioun that I haif no^{t} doyn my deutye to the authorite as ane noble man awtht, Albeit I am not bund to gif zou accompt zit will I meynteyn that tharin ze haif falslie leyt. JAMES, ERLE OF ARRAN.

No. XII.

SUMMONS of TREASON against JAMES, EARL of BOTHWELL.—2d May 1565.[1]

[This was two months before Mary's marriage to Darnley, and two years before Bothwell actually seized the Queen and carried her as a prisoner to Dunbar.]

Marie by the grace of God Quene of Scottis, &c.—Quhair it is of veritie, that upon the 26 day of the monethe of Marche or thairby, in the year of God 1562 zeiris, James Erle Bothwile Lord Halis and Admirall of our realme, being laitlie reconciliat and agreit with James Erle of Arrane, vpone sic debatis and contraverseis as had happinnit amangis thame of befoir, precogitat, consavit and conspyrit the treasonabill purpos and interpryise heireftir mentionat aganis our nobill persoune, and did that wes in him to bring the samin to pass, and to have persuadit our said cousing to have assistit and tane parte with him in his maist treasonabill interpryse, vsand sik wordis argumentis and persuasions as he thocht mycht best serue for the purpoise: That is To say, The said James Erle Boithwill, the day foirsaid proponit and earnestlie desyrit our said cousing to consert and assist to him in this manner, saying "I knaw ze haif innemies in Court that stoppis zow of zour desyre at the Quenis Mat^{eis} hand, quha will nevir ceise quhill thai have destroyit zow and zour faderis House; bot and ze will vse my counsale I sall fynd the meyne to eschewe the haill wrek thairof, and bring zow to zour purpoise. And this way sall we wirk. Howsone the Quenis Maiestie cumis vpone the south syde of the Watter of Forth quhilk wilbe schortlie eftir Pasche, we sall prowyde

[1] Pitcairn, i. 462.

and keip in cumpany samony freindis seruandis and part-takaris, as salbe abill, quhenne hir Ma^tie^ is at the Hunting vpone the feildis, or vtherways passand hir time mirralie, to execute this purpose That is to say, we sall cutt in pecis samony of hir counsalouris seruandis or vtheris that will make ws resistance, and sall tak hirself with us captive and haif hir to the Castell of Dumbertane, and thair keep hir surelie, or vthirwise demayne hir persoun at zour plesour quhill scho aggré to quhatsumeuir thing ze sall desyre!"—Saying also, "This thing is maist easie to be done quhenne hir Ma^tie^ salbe drawin furth of the Palice of Halyrudehouse to pass hir tyme vpoune the feildis, in quiet manner. And gif ze tak ony feir to execute this enterpryse, be reasoune of the hasard or difficulty thairof ze sall onlye bot stand and behald me put all thingis foirsaid to execution."

Bothwell failed to appear in answer to this summons, fled to France, and was outlawed 2d May 1565.

No. XIII.

EXTRACTS.—RANDOLPH to CECIL, 15th March 1565.
(State Paper Office, Scotland, x. No. 27.)

* * * *

I thynke good to lett y^r^ h. understonde that thys Q. is daylie in hande w^th^ me to knowe howe sone I judge that the q. Ma^tie^ will tayke some resolution what waye she intendeth to conclude in those thinges that so longe tyme have byne in communication

* * * *

* * * *

Of my L. Bothwels arrivall I dowte not but yo^{r} ho^{r} [1] is advertised, for so I desyred my L. of Bedforde as his L. had occasion to sende. The q. nowe altogether myslykethe his home coñinge wth owte her g.[2] licence She hathe alreddie sente a sergante of armes to somonde hym to under lye the law, w^{ch} yf he refuse to do he shalbe pronounced rebell Because that yt is thoughte that he will leave thys countrie agayne, and perchance for a tyme seeke some refuge in Englande, I am requyred to write unto yo^{r} h. to be a meane unto the q. Ma^{tie} that he may have no receate wth in her Ma^{ties} reaulme, and that warninge therof maye be geven to the Q. Ma^{ties} officers, as I have allreddie wrytten to my L. of Bedforde and Sir John Fisher For as myche also as my L. of Bothwell is charged by Murraye y^{t} came late owte of F. to have spoken dyvers unhonorable wordes agaynste thys Q., and also to have threatened the Earle of Murraye and L. of Lid. that he wolde be the deathe of them bothe at his retorne into Scotlande, and y^{t} Murraye callethe to wytnes of these wordes one Dandie pringle dwelling besides Newcastle, my L. of Murraye hathe wrytten hymself and also desyred me to write to the said pringle that he come hyther unto hym wth all convenient speede, to knowe what he is hable to saye towchinge those matters Thys Pringle at that tyme was servant to the Earle Bothewell, and hathe promised if he be called to verefie the same.

* * * *

[1] Your honour. [2] Grace's.

No. XIV.

LETTER, The Earl of Morton to Sir John Forster, July 1566, as to an Accusation made by the King and Bothwell against Murray, Lethington, and others, as the Devisers of the Slaughter of Riccio.—(Extracted from original in State Paper Office, Scotland, Elizabeth, vol. xii. No. 89.)

My Lord uppoun advertisement fur^{t} out of scotland frome our frendis thair it was writtin that the King and the Erle Bothveill was labouring for ane remission to George Douglas and was like to obtene the same at the queines grace our maisters hand And that the King had said that George Douglas had promyse at his hame cuming to declair that y^{e} Erle of Murray, the secretar, and sum otheris quhome y^{e} Quenis g^{l} knew not of, war y^{e} devysaris and purpos makaris of y^{e} slauchter of Davye. And y^{e} erle Bothveill sending ane servant of his to zour L. for ane lycence to send ane of his to the Newcastill for payment of silver, quhair nane was awind, gaif me occasion to suspectt that to be of trewth quhilk was wrytten to me of befoir, quhair uppon I wratt my oppinionn to zo L. how that I tho^{t} it metar that George should have bene stayit for ane quhile nor suffrit to pas in Scotland to mak ony report uppon the men quha war y^{e} q ma^{ties} of Inglandes maist speciall frendes that her hignes had in scotland Sen that tyme I have laborit to knaw the trewth of that mater, and am advertist fur^{t} of scotland that y^{e} King and y^{e} Erle Boithveill had laborit for George Douglas, bot now was not liklie to speid as it was first written to me, for y^{e} quenis Ma^{te} lykit nae thing thair desyir, albeit the Kyng had promysit in George Douglas name as is afore written, zit is

[1] Grace.

tho^{t} that he spak the same on his awin Inventioun w^{t}out ony sic advertismẽt send to him be George Douglas, athir upon hatret and malice borne be him against y^{e} Erle of Murray and y^{e} secretar, or ellis to draw y^{e} suspicioun of him self that he was not the devysir of that mater, quhilk he will nevir be able to do, for George Douglas will plainly testifie in his presence that the king was in y^{e} devyse of y^{e} slaughter, the place quhair it suld be done, and y^{e} maner of y^{e} doing thairof, and causit him to perswaid my Lord Ruthven, that deid is, to assist and take part w^{t} y^{e} king in that Actiounn ; and I have travellit w^{t} George my self quha awtterlie denyis that ever he spake or send ony sic wourde to y^{e} King as he has reportit of him, and offres to defend it w^{t} his body agains ony that will allege it, for it was nevir his menyng nor intent to sklander the erle of Murray, the secretar, nor any othir nobill man for that deid, but wold justifie thame to be innocent thairof.

No. XV.

The WILL of the EARL of MURRAY, dated 2d April 1567, appoints Dame Agnes Keith (his wife), John Earl of Mar, John Wishart of Petairo, William Douglas of Lochleven, and William Kirkcaldy of Grange, his executors ; and "Marie, Queen of Scots, overishwoman (umpire) of my testament, to see all things handled and ruled for the weill of my dochter." (Printed by the Bannatyne Club, *Morton Papers*, vol. i. p. 19.)

No. XVI.

1.

PRIVY COUNCIL of SCOTLAND, 8th October 1566, to the QUEEN-MOTHER of FRANCE.—(Chalmers, ii. 189 ; Keith, 347.)

About ten or twelve days ago, the queen at our request came to this town of Lisleburgh[1] to give her orders about some affairs of state, which without her personal presence could not be got dispatched. Her majesty was desirous the king should have comed along with her ; but because he liked to remain at Stirling and wait her return thither, she left him there, with intention to go towards him again, in five or six days. Meantime, while the queen was absent, the Earl of Lennox his father came to visit him at Stirling ; and having remained with him two or three days, he went his way again to Glasgow, the ordinary place of his abode. From Glasgow my Lord Lennox wrote to the queen, and acquainted her majesty, that although formerly both by letters and messages, and now also by communication with his son, he had endeavoured to divert him from an enterprize he had in view, he nevertheless had not the interest to make him alter his mind. This project, he tells the queen, was to retire out of the kingdom beyond sea ; and for this purpose he had just then a ship lying ready. The Earl of Lennox's letter came to the queens hand on St. Michael's day (29th September) and her majesty was pleased to impart the same incontinent to the Lords of her Council, in order to receive advice thereupon. And if her majesty was surprised by this advertisement from

[1] Edinburgh.

the Earl of Lennox, these Lords were no less astonished to understand that the king, who may justly esteem himself happy upon account of the honour the queen has been pleased to confer upon him, and whose chief aim should be to render himself grateful for her bounty, and behave himself honourably and dutifully towards her, should entertain any thought of departing after so strange a manner out of her presence; nor was it possible for them to form a conjecture from whence such an imagination could take its rise. Their Lordships therefore took a resolution to talk with the king, that they might learn from himself the occasion of this hasty deliberation of his (if any such he had), and likewise that they might thereby be enabled to advise her majesty after what manner she should comport herself in this conjuncture. The same evening the King came to Edinburgh, but made some difficulty to enter into the palace, by reason that three or four Lords were at that time present with the queen, and peremptorily insisted that they might be gone before he would condescend to come in, which deportment appeared to be abundantly unreasonable since they were three of the greatest lords in the kingdom; and that those Kings who by their own birth were sovereigns of the realm, have never acted in that manner towards the nobility. The queen however received this behaviour as decently as was possible, and condescended so far as to meet the King without the palace, and so conducted him into her own apartment, where he remained all night; and then her majesty entered calmly with him upon the subject of his going abroad, that she might understand from himself the occasion of such a resolution. But he would by no means give or acknowledge that he had any occasion offered him of discontent. The Lords of Council being acquainted early next morning that the King was just a going to return to Stirling, they repaired to the

queen's apartment; and no other person being present except their Lordships and Mons. du Croc, whom they prayed to assist with them, as being here on the part of your majesty, the occasion of their meeting together was then with all humility and reverence due to their majesties, proposed; namely, to understand from the King, whether, according to advice imparted to the queen by the Earl of Lennox, he had formed a resolution to depart by sea out of the realm, and upon what ground, and for what end? That if his resolution proceeded from discontent, they were earnest to know what persons had afforded an occasion for the same? that if he could complain of any of the subjects of the realm, be they of what quality soever, the fault should be immediately repaired to his satisfaction. And here we did remonstrate to him, that his own honour, the queen's honour, the honour of us all, were concerned; for if without just occasion ministered, he would retire from the place he had received so much honour and abandon the society of her to whom he is so far obliged, that in order to advance him she has humbled herself, and from being his sovereign had surrendered herself to be his wife: if he should act in this sort, the whole world would blame him as ingrate, regardless of the friendship the queen bare him, and utterly unworthy to possess the place to which she had exalted him. On the other hand, that if any just occasion had been given him, it behoved the same to be very important; since it inclined him to relinquish so beautiful a queen and noble realm: and the same must have been afforded him either by the queen herself, or by us her ministers. As for us, we professed ourselves ready to do him all the justice he could demand; and for her majesty, so far was she from ministering to him occasion of discontent, that on the contrary he had all the reason in the world to thank God for giving him so wise and virtuous a person, as she showed herself in

all her actions. Then her Majesty was pleased to enter into the discourse, and spoke affectionately to him, beseeching him that seeing he would not open his mind in private to her the last night, according to her most earnest request, he would at least be pleased to declare before these lords, where she had offended him in anything; she likewise said, that she had a clear conscience that in all her life she had done no action which could anyway prejudice either his or her own honour; but nevertheless that as she might perhaps have given him offence without design, she was willing to make amends as far as he should require; and therefore prayed him not to dissemble the occasion of his displeasure, if any he had, nor to spare her in the least matter. But tho' the queen and all others that were present, together with Mons. du Croc, used all the interest they were able, to persuade him to open his mind; yet he would not at all own that he intended any voyage, or had any discontent; and declared freely that the Queen had given him no occasion for any: whereupon he took leave of her majesty and went his way: so that we were all of opinion that this was but a false alarm the Earl of Lennox was willing to give her majesty. Nevertheless by a letter which the King has since wrote to the queen in a sort of disguised stile, it appears that he still has it in his head to leave the Kingdom, and there is advertisement otherwise that he is secretly preparing to be gone :—of all which, and what passed betwixt their majesties and us, we could not fail to inform you, and to testify, like as we do by these presents, that so far as things could come to our knowledge he has no ground of complaint; but on the contrary that he has the very best of reason to look upon himself as one of the most fortunate princes in Christendom, could he but know his own happyness, and make use of the good fortune which God has put into his hands. 'Tis true

that in the letter he wrote the queen he grounds a complaint on two points, one is, that her majesty trusts him not with so much authority, nor is at such pains to advance him and make him be honoured in the nation, as she at first did: and the other point is that nobody attends him, and that the nobility deserts his company. To those two points the queen has made answer, that if the case be so, he ought to blame himself, not her; for that in the beginning she had conferred so much honour upon him, as came afterwards to render herself very uneasy, the credit and reputation wherein she had placed him having served as a shadow to those who have most heinously offended her majesty; but howsoever, that she has, notwithstanding this, continued to show him such respect, that altho' they who did perpetrate the murder of her faithful servant had entred her chamber with his knowledge, having followed him close at the back, and had named him the chief of their enterprize, yet would she never accuse him thereof, but did always excuse him, and was willing to appear as if she believed it not. And then as to his being not attended, the fault thereof must be charged upon himself, since she has always made an offer to him of her own servants. And for the nobility, they come to court and pay deference and respect according as they have any matters to do, and as they receive a kindly countenance: But that he is at no pains to gain them, and make himself beloved by them, having gone so far as to prohibite these noblemen to enter his room who she had at first appointed to be about his person: if the nobility abandon him, his own deportment towards them is the cause thereof; for if he desires to be followed and attended by them, he must in the first place make them to love him; and to this purpose, must render himself amiable to them; without which it will prove a most difficult task for her majesty to regulate this point, especially

to make the nobility consent that he shall have the management of affairs put into his hands; because she finds them utterly averse to any such matter.

2.

LETTER by DE CROC, the French Ambassador, to CATHERINE DE MEDICIS, Queen-Mother of France, dated Jedburgh, 17th October 1566.—(Found by Count Labanoff in the Royal Library at Paris, MS. de Harlay, No. 218.)

(*Extracts.*)

"Great preparations are making for the baptism, and the Lords here are putting themselves in grand order in contemplation of performing their *devoir* well and suitably on that occasion, those of that religion as well as the Catholics. And I must tell you that both the Lords and those who are in correspondence with the King and your Majesty, are so well reconciled together with the Queen, through her wise conduct, that now I cannot perceive a single division.

"But if the Queen and these Lords are well together, the King her husband is as ill, both with the one side and the other; nor can it be otherwise, according to the manner in which he deports himself, for he wants to be all in all, and chief governor of everything; and so he puts himself in the way of being nothing.

"He often bewails himself to me; and one day I told him 'that if he would do me the honour of informing me what it was he complained of in the Queen and the nobles, I would take the liberty of mentioning it to them.' He said, as he has often done, that he 'wished to return to the same state he was in when first married.' I assured him 'he could never return to that; and if he had found himself well off

then, it behoved him to have kept so ; that he must perceive that the Queen having been outraged in her person, could never reinstate him in the authority he had before ; and that he ought to be very well contented with the honours and benefits she gave him in treating and honouring him as King-Consort, and supplying him and his household very liberally with all things requisite.'"

"The Queen, your daughter-in-law, returns from Stirling to Edinburgh for an assembly which meets there every year at the time of the vacations, which are from the month of August until Martinmas, to which the Lords and Estates of the realm are called, to consider her Majesty's affairs. The King was living at Stirling, where the Earl of Lennox, his father, found him, and after having spoken to him, the Earl retired to Glasgow, which is his ordinary residence. He wrote to the Queen that he had found the King thinking of going abroad, and that he had a ship ready for the purpose, and that he had not succeeded in dissuading him. He prayed her Majesty to do what she could about it. The Queen received the letter on Michaelmas morning. The King arrived the same evening at ten o'clock. Their Majesties being together, the Queen spoke to him on this subject, praying him to tell her the cause of his going away, and if he had any complaint against her. He did not wish to say anything about it to her ; and the Queen, considering of how much importance his voyage was, resolved, very wisely and advisedly, to send at once for all the Lords and others of her Council, and also to command my attendance. When we were all assembled, the Bishop of Ross, by the Queen's desire, mentioned the King's voyage in his presence, and that the evidence the Queen had of it was a letter which the Earl of Lennox had written to her on the subject. The letter was read. The Queen made a very beautiful address, and after-

wards prayed and entreated him with all her power to declare in the presence of all if she had given him any occasion. She prayed him for the love of God, and with joined hands, not to spare her.

"The Lords also said to him that they saw easily that he looked ill upon them, that they did not know if they were the cause of his going, and they prayed him to tell them how they had offended him? For my part I said that his voyage concerned the honour of both the Queen and himself; that if he went with cause this touched the Queen; if he went otherwise it could not be praiseworthy. He left us only one conclusion, for he declared at last that he had no occasion whatever. The Queen said that she was content, and we all cried to her that she ought to be content. I added that according to my function, I would witness everywhere to the truth of what I had seen and what I should see. Thus he, without cause, as he declared, and in vexation, bade adieu to the Queen, without kissing her, telling her that her Majesty should not see him for a long time. Thus we remained near the Queen, your daughter-in-law, doing our best to console her, and praying her to continue in wisdom and virtue, and not to distress nor grieve herself, for that the truth should be well known everywhere.

"In about three or four days the Queen was informed that he for certain continued his embarkation, and had a ship all ready.

"Her Majesty has come into this town of Jedburgh, which is on the English frontier, where her presence was much required this long time, to distribute justice, and she expects to remain about ten or twelve days.

"I was staying in Edinburgh. The King sent to beg me to meet him nine miles from Edinburgh, where he came with his father. I saw well that he did not know the position he

is in. He wished the Queen to recall him. I told him that since he had gone off without cause, as he had declared, I did not wish to doubt the Queen's goodness, but that many a wife would not send to ask after him. I believe that he wishes, as far as I can understand him, to temporise till after the baptism, since he has made nothing of it; for, in my opinion, there are only two things which provoke him: the first is the reconciliation of the Lords with the Queen—at least he is afraid they will show more respect to her Majesty than to him, and he is so haughty and proud he would not like foreigners to know it; and the other is, that he is convinced that whoever comes to the baptism for the Queen of England will not recognise him. He is much afraid of receiving an affront. If he were well advised and counselled not to meddle more than he should, he would not be in the distress in which he is.

"The Queen, your daughter-in-law, when coming to this town of Jedburgh, sent the Earl of Bothwell before, because he is Lieutenant-General of this border, and in making a swoop on the thieves he was badly wounded, but he is out of danger, which the Queen is very glad of—he would be no small loss to her. Lethington has been restored for about three weeks."[1]

[1] Translated from the original letter in Labanoff, i. 374.

No. XVII.

EXTRACTS from a curious and almost illegible Old Manuscript in the British Museum, supposed to be in ARCHIBALD DOUGLAS' handwriting, containing a Recital of MURRAY'S schemes and conduct down to MARY'S escape from Lochleven.—(British Museum, Cotton MS., Caligula, B. viii. 129.)

My lord of Morray Wy^{t} advis of his secret consell [on pretence?][1] of ye setting furth of ye word of God . . . . was ay to usurp ye Crowin and to place hymself in ye rowim of ye octorate [authority] and to bring hym to y^{t} effek yat drew duk Hamilton [illegible] and yairafter causit ane zoung inosent man ye king to consent to consper ye slaughter of David in presens of ye quenes majeste, haifing na respek to ye suksessyoun of yis realme of Scotland being in hir graces wame at yat present, thinking would at syk tarrabill slauchter in hir graces presense suld haif gifin hir grace ocasyoun to haif departit wy^{t} yis said suksessyoun [then] in hir graces wame, and seing yat interprys tuk no^{t} effek dewyset yairafter ye slauchter of ye said king, and laid ye brut and doing of ye said slauchter upon ye quenes magistee, and after yat causit syk brut to pass throw ye comon peipill, maid insureksyoun contraire hir grace, aleging yair quarrel was to punys ye kingis slauchter, under collour of your forsaid pretens quhill sik tyme yai attaint hir graces person in captewite and ward, compellit hir grace for feer of her lyf to resing [resign] and demit hir graces crown and actorate in ye handis of hir graces sone, and my Lord of Morray to be regent xvij yeris, and yerafter convenit ane fenyeit parlament To ratefe and approf of

[1] Torn here.

yere forsaid ungodlie prosedinges, and shew fenyeit [feigned] writingis in ye said parlament maikin ye haill comon pepill to beleif and wnderstand yat ye quenes mageste was no^{t} worde [worthy] to rynge as prens [prince] & some raite [write?] on yame, quhilk was ane gret ocasyoun to mvif [move] ye comon pepile to beleif ye sam, becaus hir grace vas no^{t} suferit to cowm in presens of hir graces nobelete to justifie hir graces awne cause.—And becaus god vod no^{t} sufer yeir ungodlie enterprys and prosedynges to tak effek, bot will haif y^{e} trutht tryit and warate [right?] declarit, and for warafeing [verifying] of ye same at his pleasur his almyty godhead of his gret infinit power by ye inspeksyoun of men to relief ye quenes magestie our soverain furth of captiwete and ward to be yat instrument under God to declair to hir graces trew subgekis ye trutht and warate in all causis, and in quhat maner hir grace has bene usit and handlit wy^{t} ane perticuler company of hir graces untrew inobedient subgekes, and now hir grace being at liberte and fredome has declarit hir graces mynd in all causis to hir graces nobilite and consell quhilk declarasyons will be maid mair publick to all her graces trew obedient subgekis.

Finis quod Maister Jamis Balfour
quha sold ye castell in ane ill hour.

In dorso—Ane declaration of my Lord of Murraye.

No. XVIII.

1.

The NAMES of such as are to be entertayned in Scotland by Pencions out of England.—(From original in British Museum, Caligula, c. v.)

	£	
The Regent . .	500	⊏ Moreton.
⫫ Thearle of Angush .	100	⊏ E. Rothos daughter.
Thearle of Atholl .	200	△ Fleminge Grand Prieurs Sister.
Thearle of Argile .	200	The E. Marshalls daughter.
⫫ Thearle of Montrosse .	100	△ Dromond daug.
⫫ Thearle of Rothosse .	100	⊏ Ruthis sister. Mefens wife.
⫫ × Thearle of Clinkarn (Glencairn) . .	100	
⫫ × The Countesse of Marre	200	Tilliburnes sister.
The M^r of Askyn (Erskine) . .	150	Humes sister.
The L. Glames . .	100	⊏
The L. Ruthin . .	100	△ L. Mefens sister.
The L. Lindsay . .	100	L. Lochleuins sister.
The L. Boyd . .	100	M^r
The L. Harris (Herries)	100	M^r
⫫ × The L. Maxwell .	100	M^r E. of Anguish sister.
⫫ × The L. Loughleuin .	50	⊏ ⫫ 2000.
The L. Boldukell .	50	
The L. of Domwrassell (Drumwhassel) .	100	
The L. of Ormeston .	50	L. Cawdens daughter.
James M'gell . .	100	M^r
Buckannon . .	100	M^r
Nicholas Eluiston .	50	
Peter Younge scholem^r	30	
Alexander Hay . .	40	
Carmichell . .		

2.

LETTER, KILLIGREW to LORD BURGHLEY, as to how Elizabeth might "oversee" the Murders (of Darnley, Murray, etc.), and the persons in Scotland "to be considered with Pensions," 14th March 1573.—(From original in State Paper Office, Scotland, Elizabeth, vol. xxiv. art 50.)

* * * *

the too poyntes of y^{r} lre w^{ch} I leyfte unaunswered before, to wytt how her M^{te} might over se the morthers, and what pension wth the least might be bestowed here.

* * * *

the first Regent had the contryver of his death the bischope of St. Andw^{s} hanged and the doers be yet excepted.

* * * *

Touching the Pensions Theise be the men to be considered of,—the Regent, therles of Hontley and Argyle, the L. Boyd, who is able to kepe Argyle in tune and beareth a great stroke in the west, Sir James Bolfoure and alexandre hay. the som to content them and to kepe̅ them and this Contry at her Ma^{tes} devotion is after my calculation 1200^{li} sterling by the yere. Whereof 500^{li} for the Regent, 200 for hontley, 200 for Argyle, 100 for the lord Boyd, and 100 for Adam of Gordon, whom I forgatt before. the other 100 betwyne Sir James Balfoure and Sandy hay, to wytt 100 mark sterling to Sir James, who wold in my pore jugment deserve the same, and the 50 marke to thother who also wyll deserve no lesse. As for the Castylliance[1] I can say nothing. If her M^{te} wyll bestow but 1000^{li} sterling, then Adam of Gordon Sir James Balfoure and hay must

[1] Kirkcaldy of Grange and Lethington, who had seized and kept the castle of Edinburgh.

be leyft out. I have felt my L. of Argyle, who wyll accept 200li of her Mte if it shall please her to bestow yt, and yet I am sure he may have 2000 ∆ of France at this present, and hontley atholl and others as myche. ye I know the Regent hemselfe hathe bin delt wth even by my lord Heton, but if her Mte wyll take the tyme and thoccasion I am sure france shall fayle of ther porpose, contrary onlesse they may se her Mate consentand to ron a good course for her selfe and her neighbours I doubt me the Regent wyll not wade so farr.

* * * *

No. XIX.

EVIDENCE of the EARLS of HUNTLY and ARGYLE touching the Murder of the King of Scots.—(British Museum.)

(*Extract.*)

In the zeir of God 1566 zeiris, in the moneth of December or thairby, efter hir Hienes's greit and extreme seikness, and retourning from Jedwart, hir Grace being in the castel of Craigmillar accompanyit be us above written, and be the Erlis of Bothwell, Murray and secretaire Lethingtoun; the said Erle of Murray and Lethingtoun came in the chamber of us the Erle of Ergile in the morning, we being in our bed; quha "lamenting the banishment of the Erle of Mortoun, Lordis Lyndsay and Rowen (Ruthven), with the rest of thair factioun, said, That the occasioun of the murthour of David, slane be thame in presence of the Quene's Majestie, was for to troubill and impesche the parliament, quhairin the Erle of Murray and utheris sould have bene foirfaltit and declarit rebellis. And seing that the samin was cheiflie for the weil-fare of the Erle of Murray, it sould be estemit ingratitude gif he and his freindis, in reciproque manner, did not enterpryse

all that wer [in thair] puissance for releif of the saidis banishit; quhairfoir thay thocht, that we, of our part, sould have bene as desyrous thairto as thay wer."

And we agreing to the same, to do all that was in us for thair releif, provyding that the Quene's Majestie sould not be offendit thairat: On this Lethingtoun proponit and said, "That the narrest and best way till obtene the said Erle of Mortoun's pardoun, was to promise to the Quene's Majestie to find ane moyen (means) to mak devorcement betwixt hir Grace and the king hir husband quha had offendit hir Hieness sa hielie in mony wayes."

Quhairunto we answering, That we knew not how that myght be done; Lethingtoun said, the Erle of Murray being ever present, "My Lord, cair zou not thairof. We sall fynd the meane weill aneuch to mak hir quite of him, swa that ze and my Lord of Huntlie will onlie behald the matter, and not be offendit thairat."

And then thay send to my Lord of Huntlie, praying him to cum to our chalmer.

This is as thay dealit with us particularlie. Now lat us shaw quhat followit efter that we wer assemblit. We Erle of Huntlie being in the said chalmer, the saidis Erle of Murray and Lethingtoun oppinit the matter lykwise to us in manner foirsaid, promising, if we wald consent to the samin, that thay sould fynd the mean to restoir us in our awin landis and offices, and thay to stand guid friendis unto us and cause the said Erle of Mortoun, Rowen, and all the rest of that cumpanie, to do the like in time cuming. Our answer was, it sould not stop be us that the matter cum not to effect, in all that myght be proffitfull and honorabill baith for thame and us, and specialle quhair the pleasour weill and contentment of the Quene's Majestie consistit. And thairon we four, viz. Erlis of Huntlie, Ergile, Murray, and secretaire Lethingtoun

past all to the Erle of Bothwell's chalmer, to understand his advise on thir thingis proponit; quhairin he ganesaid not mair than we.

Swa thairefter we past altogidder towardis the Quene's Grace; quhair Lethingtoun, efter he had rememberit hir Majestie of ane greit nombre of grevious and intollerabell offences that the King, as he said, ingrait of the honour ressavit of hir Hienes, had done to hir Grace, and continewing everie day from evil to worse; proponit, "That gif it pleisit her Majestie to pardoun the Earl of Mortoun, Lordis Rowen, and Lyndsay with thair cumpanie, thay sould fynd the meanis with the rest of the nobilitie, to mak divorcement betwixt hir Hienes and the King hir husband, quhilk sould not neid hir Grace to mell thairwith. To the quhilk it was necessare, that hir Majestie tak heid to mak resolutioun thairin, als weill for hir awin easement als weill of the realme; for he troublit hir Grace and us all, and remaining with hir Majestie wald not ceis till he did hir sum uther evil turn, quhen that her Hienes wald be mekil impeschit to put remeid thairto."

Efter thir persuasions and utheris divers, quhilk the said Lethingtoun usit by [besides] those that everie ane of us schew particularlie to hir Majestie to bring hir to the said purpois; hir Grace answerit, "That under twa conditionnis scho myght understand the samin; the ane, that the divorcement wer maid lauchfullie; the uthir that it war not prejudice to hir sone; utherwayis hir Hienes wold rather endure all tormentis; and abyde the perrellis that myght chaunce hir in hir Grace's lyftyme." The Erle of Bothwell answerit, "That he doubtit not bot the divorcement myght be maid but [without] prejudice in ony wayis of my Lord Prince;" alledging the exampill of himself, that he ceissit not to succeid to his father's heritage without any difficultie, albeit thair was divorce betwixt him and his mother.

It was alswa proponit, that efter thair divorcement the King sould be him allane [by himself] in ane part of the countrey and the Quene's Majestie in an uther, or ellis he should reteir him in ane uther realme; and heiron hir Majestie said, "That *peradventure he wald change opinioun*, and that *it were better that scho hirself for ane tyme passit in France, abyding till he acknowledgit himself.*" Then Lethingtoun taking the speache, said, "Madame, Fancie ze not we ar heir of the principal of zour Grace's nobilitie and counsal, that sall fynd the moyen [means] that zour Majestie sall be quyte [quit] of him without prejudice of zour sone. And albeit that my *Lord of Murray heir present be lyttil les scrupulous for ane Protestant, nor zour Grace is for ane Papist, I am assurit he will luik throw his fingers thairto, and will behold our doingis saying nathing to the samin.*" The Quene's Majestie answerit, "I WILL THAT ZE DO NATHING QUHAIRTHRO ONY SPOT MAY BE LAYIT TO MY HONOR OR CONSCIENCE, and thairfor I pray zou rather LET THE MATTER BE IN THE ESTAIT AS IT IS, ABYDING TILL GOD OF HIS GUIDNESS PUT REMEID THAIRTO; that ze beleifing to do me service may possibill turn to my hurt and despleasour." "Madame (said Lethingtoun), "lat us guyde the matter amangis us, and zour Grace sall se nathing but guid, and APPROVIT BE PARLIAMENT."[1]

The EARL of MURRAY'S ANSWER, pasted on the back of the foregoing.

(*Extract.*)

Because the custume of my adversaris is, and has bene rather to calumpniat and backbite me in my absence than befoir my face; and that it may happen thame, quhen I am

[1] Goodall, ii. 317.

departit furth of this realme, sclanderouslie and untrewlie to report untreuthis of me, and namelie towardis sum spechis haldin in my hearing at Craigmillar in the moneth of November 1566, I have alreaddie declarit to the Quene's Majestie the effect of the haill purposis spokin in my audience at the samin tyme, sincerelie and trewlie as I will answer to Almychtie God, unconceilling ony part to my remembrance, as hir Hienes I traist will report. And farther in cais ony man will say and affirm that ever I was present quhen ony purposis wer haldin at Craigmillar in my audience, tending to ony unlauchful or dishonorabill end, or that ever I subscrivit ony band there, or that ony purpois was haldin anent the subscriving of ony band be me, to my knawledge, I avow thay speik wickitlie and untrewlie, quhilk I will mantene aganis thame, as becumis ane honest man, to the end of my lyfe; onlie this far the subscriptioun of bandis by me is trew. That indeed I subscrivit ane band with the Erlis of Huntlie, Ergile, and Bothwell in Edinburgh at the beginning of October the samin zeir 1566, quhilk wes devysit in signe of our reconciliatioune in respect of the former grudges and despleasouris that had bene amangis us.[1]

No. XX.

LETTER, the MASTER of GRAY to Sir FRANCIS WALSINGHAM, 17th May 1586.—(State Paper Office, Scotland, vol. xxxix. No. 85.)

Mr Arch^{d} Douglas shalbe God willing varie schortly put to a tryall—for the K. (King) since my last haithe condiscendit to all thinges, and Thay qwho of befoir opposit themselvis are now content of freindschipe. I pray you, albeit y^{e}

[1] Goodall, ii. 321.

matter be not gryt, yt if the 1000£ can be haid yt it be, for I haid aneuche to do for to cause ye K. resave it, and sume directly opposit them selfis and was glaid to have occasion—Bot it shall not be neidfull hir matie know so mutche—I leave you sir in Godis holy protection.

From our Court ye 17 of May.

Note.—This letter is dated nine days before Douglas's trial, *and the writer of it,* the Master of Gray, *was foreman of the jury at the trial.*

XXI.

EXTRACTS from MARY STUART'S WILL—1566. She leaves twenty-six bequests to her husband the King, among others, "A diamond ring, enamelled in red;" opposite to which she writes, in her own hand—Cest celui de quoy je fus espousee—Au roi qui la mie donne (*Inventorics,* Preface 33). She also leaves a diamond to his father, and two to his mother.

A madame de Boduel.	Une couiffe garnye de rubiz perles et grenatz. Ung collit aussy garny (do.) Une paire de manches garnies de rubiz perles et grenatz.
A mon frere de Mora.	Ung diamant en pointe sans feuile.
Au Conte de Mar.	Une table de moyse avec deux diamans.
Au Conte Boduel.	Une table de diamant emaille en noir.

Au quatre Maries.	Quatre autres petis diamant de diverse façon.
Au Conte d'Arguilles.	Ung ruby, &c.
Au Conte Hontelay.	Ung ruby, &c.
Au Conte d'Atol.	Une table de ruby, &c.
Au ma soeur.	Une ruby, &c.

Printed by R. Clark, *Edinburgh.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 389 865 6